



Catalogue no. 85-227-XIE

Criminal Justice Indicators

2005



Statistics
Canada

Statistique
Canada

Canada

How to obtain more information

Specific inquiries about this product and related statistics or services should be directed to: Canadian Centre for Justice, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0T6 (Toll free 1 800 387-2231 or (613) 951-9023).

For information on the wide range of data available from Statistics Canada, you can contact us by calling one of our toll-free numbers. You can also contact us by e-mail or by visiting our website.

National inquiries line	1 800 263-1136
National telecommunications device for the hearing impaired	1 800 363-7629
Depository Services Program inquiries	1 800 700-1033
Fax line for Depository Services Program	1 800 889-9734
E-mail inquiries	infostats@statcan.ca
Website	www.statcan.ca

Ordering information

This product, catalogue no. 85-227-XIE, is published every 5 years in electronic format at a price of CAN\$38.00. To obtain a single issue, visit our website at www.statcan.ca and select Our Products and Services.

Standards of service to the public

Statistics Canada is committed to serving its clients in a prompt, reliable and courteous manner and in the official language of their choice. To this end, the Agency has developed standards of service which its employees observe in serving its clients. 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.ca under About Statistics Canada > Providing services to Canadians.



Statistics Canada
Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics

Criminal Justice Indicators

2005

Maire Gannon, Karen Mihorean, Karen Beattie, Andrea Taylor-Butts and
Rebecca Kong, *Statistics Canada*

Edited by Rebecca Kong, *Statistics Canada*

Published by authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada

© Minister of Industry, 2005

All rights reserved. Use of this product is limited to the licensee and its employees. The product cannot be reproduced and transmitted to any person or organization outside of the licensee's organization.

Reasonable rights of use of the content of this product are granted solely for personal, corporate or public policy research, or educational purposes. This permission includes the use of the content in analyses and the reporting of results and conclusions, including the citation of limited amounts of supporting data extracted from the data product in these documents. These materials are solely for non-commercial purposes. In such cases, the source of the data must be acknowledged as follows: Source (or "Adapted from", if appropriate): Statistics Canada, name of product, catalogue, volume and issue numbers, reference period and page(s). Otherwise, users shall seek prior written permission of Licensing Services, Marketing Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1A 0T6.

December, 2005

Catalogue no. 85-227-XIE
ISSN 1715-2240

Frequency: Every 5 years
Ottawa

Cette publication est disponible en français (n° 85-227-XIF au catalogue)

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.

Acknowledgements

This report is the result of contributions from a number of members of the federal, provincial and territorial ministries responsible for justice and public safety. The authors are grateful to each member who assisted in developing the indicators contained in this report and who provided invaluable input on this project. The authors are also grateful to Maggie Charmant, Sylvain de Léséleuc, Diane Beauchamp and Chantal Fournier-MacGillivray of the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) for their assistance in gathering information, analyzing and verifying data and preparing this report. Finally, the authors wish to thank Denyse Carrière of the CCJS for her work on translation and editing of the French manuscript and Danielle Baum of Statistics Canada for preparing the manuscript.

Table of contents

Introduction	11
Defining indicators	11
A. Prime workload indicators	13
A1 Workload of police	13
A1.1 Calls to police for service	13
A1.2 Criminal incidents known to police	13
A1.3 Criminal incidents per police officer	18
A2 Workload of diversion programs	21
A2.1 Number of people served by alternative measure, mediation, dispute resolution and diversionary programs	21
A3 Workload of criminal courts	24
A3.1 Number of cases dealt with in youth courts	24
A3.2 Number of cases dealt with in adult criminal court	26
A4 Workload of the correctional system	30
A4.1 Admissions to youth correctional institutions and average counts, by custody status	31
A4.2 Admissions to adult correctional institutions and average counts, by custody status	33
A4.3 Counts of community supervision of youths	37
A4.4 Counts of community supervision of adults	38
A5 Workload of victim services	42
A5.1 Number of persons assisted	42
B. Prime performance indicators	49
B1 Goal 1: Public order, safety and national security through prevention and intervention	50
B1.1 Overall cost of administering the sectors of the criminal justice system	50
B1.2 Number and rate of criminal incidents reported to crime victim surveys	51
B1.3 Overall victimization rate compared to other industrialized countries	54
B1.4 Use of firearms in the commission of homicide and robbery	55
B1.5 The prevalence of organized crime	58
B2 Goal 2: Offender accountability, reintegration and rehabilitation	60
B2.1 Types of sentences ordered in adult court	60
B2.2 Types of sentences ordered in youth courts	64
B2.3 Severity of sentences ordered in adult court	67
B2.4 Severity of sentences ordered in youth court	72
B2.5 Number of offenders participating in Restorative Justice Programs	75
B2.6 Canada's incarceration rate compared to other countries	76
B2.7 Rates of recidivism, including re-charging, re-convictions, and re-admission to correctional facilities	78

B3	Goal 3: Public trust, confidence, and respect for the criminal justice system	80
B3.1	Public and victim satisfaction with police, courts, and correctional and parole systems	80
B3.2	Public satisfaction with personal safety, victims versus non-victims	82
B3.3	Public fear of crime, victims versus non-victims	83
B3.4	Processing crime through the justice system	83
B4	Goal 4: Social equity and access to the criminal justice system for all citizens	90
B4.1	Number of applications for legal aid	90
B4.2	Perceptions of police, criminal courts, prison system, and parole system by Aboriginal people and visible minorities	92
B4.3	Experience of discrimination by police or courts on the basis of sex, ethnicity, race, religion, sexual orientation, age, or disability	94
B4.4	Reporting to the police, by sex of the victim	95
B4.5	Reporting to police by Aboriginal people and visible minorities	96
B5	Goal 5: Victim needs served	97
B5.1	Number of services for victims of crime	97
B5.2	Types of services offered by victim service agencies and shelters	99
B5.3	Police response to victims	100
B5.4	Involvement of victims in the court process	100
B5.5	Involvement of victims in the corrections and conditional release process	101
B5.6	Use of peace bonds and restraining orders for offenders	102
B5.7	Number of clients turned away by shelters	104
B5.8	Number of restorative justice programs	104
B5.9	Number of sentences involving restitution	105
B5.10	Compensation for victims of crime	106
C	The context of crime	121
C1	Community and society	121
C1.1	Age of the population	121
C1.2	Gender	126
C1.3	Immigration and visible minorities	126
C1.4	The national economy	129
C1.5	Income and labour force participation of individuals and families	131
C1.6	Income inequality	140
C1.7	Urbanization	141
C1.8	Housing mix: Renters, owners and housing type	143
C1.9	Social capital: Social interactions and determinants, and outcomes/consequences of interactions	143
C1.10	Perceptions of crime	148
C1.11	Gang activity and organized crime	149
C1.12	Hate-motivated crime	149
C2	Family	153
C2.1	Family structure	153
C2.2	Divorce	155
C2.3	Child custody and support	156
C2.4	Size of households	158
C2.5	Violence in the family	158
C3	Individual	166
C3.1	Education	166
C3.2	Literacy	168

C3.3	Learning disabilities	170
C3.4	Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder	170
C3.5	Substance abuse	171
C3.6	Mental illness	172
C3.7	Self-esteem, self-concept and mastery	174
C3.8	Routine activities and structural choice	175
C3.9	Involvement in crime as a victim	175

Endnotes	182
-----------------	------------

References	191
-------------------	------------

Appendix D	201
-------------------	------------

List of Tables

Workload indicators

Table A1.1	Number of violent, property and other <i>Criminal Code</i> offences, Canada, 1977 to 2004	44
Table A2.1	Youth participation in Alternative Measures, by jurisdiction, 1998/99 to 2002/03	45
Table A3.1	Number of adult criminal court cases decision and trial/non-trial, 1994/95 to 2002/03	46
Table A4.1	Proportion of average daily counts of youth in custody, 1993/94, 2001/02 and 2002/03	46
Table A4.2	Total adult admissions to federal and provincial/territorial custody	47
Table A4.3	Number of full parole release reviews by the National Parole Board and the provincial parole boards	47
Table A5.1	Annual admissions to shelters by facility, 1998 to 2004	48

Performance indicators

Table B1.1	Rates of victimization and changes over time, Canada and the provinces, 1999 to 2004	108
Table B2.1	Youth Court Cases with convictions by type of sentence, Canada, 2003/04	109
Table B2.2	Convicted youth court cases by most serious sentence, Canada, Provinces and Territories, 2002/03	110
Table B2.3	Convicted cases in youth courts by mean and median length of custody, probation and fine amounts, Canada and the provinces and territories, 2003/04	110
Table B3.1	Perceptions of the justice system for population aged 15 and over, Canada, 1999 and 2004	111
Table B3.2	Perceptions of the criminal justice system doing a good job, population 15 and over, Canada, 1988, 1993, 1999 and 2004	112
Table B3.3	Perceptions of the criminal justice system doing a good job, by province, 2004	112
Table B3.4	Feelings of safety from crime for population aged 15 and over, 1993, 1999 and 2004	113
Table B3.5	Feelings of safety from crime for population aged 15+, by type of victimization, 2004	114
Table B4.1	Perceptions of the justice system among Aboriginals, visible minorities and the non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population, 2004	115
Table B5.1	Percentage of victim service agencies that provide selected types of services directly, by type of agency, 2002/03	117
Table B5.2	Number of shelters providing in-house services to women residents, non-residents and ex-residents, by type of service, 2003/04	118
Table B5.3	Number of peace bonds issued in adult criminal court and the number of breaches, selected jurisdictions, 2003/04	118
Table B5.4	Number and percentage of stalking victims who sought a protective order against their stalker during the past 5 years, 2004	119

Table B5.5	Number of applications for criminal injuries compensation or financial benefits for victims of crime, by province and status of applications, 2002/03	119
Table B5.6	Number of criminal injuries compensation and financial benefit applications, by decision and amount awarded, 2002/03	120

Context of crime

Table C1.1	Government transfers for families and unattached individuals, 2003	177
Table C1.2	Type of dwelling and ownership, Canada, provinces and territories, 2001	178
Table C1.3	Dwelling characteristics and ownership, Census Metropolitan Areas, 2001	179
Table C1.4	The extent to which Canadians know the people in their immediate neighbourhood, by selected characteristics, Canada, 2003	179
Table C2.1	Rate of police-reported child abuse, by family members and non-family members, subset of police services, 1998 to 2003	180
Table C3.1	High school dropout rates among 20-year-olds, Canada and the provinces, 1991 and 1999	181
Table C3.2	Rate of violent victimization, by exposure characteristics, 2004	181

List of figures

Workload indicators

Figure A1.1	Police-reported rate of violent crime stable while 'other' <i>Criminal Code</i> offences on the rise, 1977 to 2004	14
Figure A1.2	Police-reported crime rate highest in Saskatchewan and the territories, 2004	15
Figure A1.3	Saskatchewan reported the highest rate of violent crime among provinces in 2004	15
Figure A1.4	British Columbia reported the highest rate of property crime among provinces in 2004	16
Figure A1.5	Ontario reported the lowest rate of 'other <i>Criminal Code</i> ' incidents among the provinces in 2004	16
Figure A1.6	Number of homicides increased 13% in 2004	17
Figure A1.7	Among the provinces, Manitoba reported the highest homicide rate in 2004	18
Figure A1.8	The number of criminal incidents per police officer has generally been declining since 1991	19
Figure A1.9	Among the provinces, number of criminal incidents per police officer were highest in the western provinces, 2003	19
Figure A2.1	Community service order most common alternative measures administered to youth among reporting jurisdictions, 2002/03	23
Figure A3.1	Number of youth cases has been generally decreasing since 1991/92	25
Figure A3.2	Youth case rates highest in Nunavut, 2003/04	25
Figure A3.3	Number of cases heard in adult criminal courts dropped in 2003/04	27
Figure A3.4	Adult case rates per 1,000 population highest in the Yukon Territory, 2003/04	27
Figure A3.5	The proportion of cases with five or more appearances has grown since 1994/95	28
Figure A4.1	Sentenced custody for youth decreasing, while remand increasing, 1993/94-2002/03	31
Figure A4.2	Admissions to youth custody on the decline	32
Figure A4.3	Number of sentenced inmates in adult correctional institutions is on the decline	34
Figure A4.4	Average daily count of adults in remand and other temporary detention increasing, 1978/79 to 2002/03	35
Figure A4.5	Violent offences account for greater proportion of youth probation admissions, 1997/98 to 2002/03	38
Figure A4.6	Average monthly counts of adults released on parole have been dropping	40
Figure A5.1	Number of admissions of women and dependant children to shelters, 1992/93 to 2003/04	43
Figure A5.2	Number of women residing in shelters because of abuse, snapshot day, 1992 to 2004	43

Performance indicators

Figure B1.1	Per capita spending on justice services on the rise since 1997/98	51
Figure B1.2	Rates of violent victimization remain unchanged	53
Figure B1.3	Rates of household property theft and vandalism continue to increase	53
Figure B1.4	Among international rates of victimization, Canada is in the top third	55
Figure B1.5	Since 1979, firearms homicides have accounted for about one-third of homicides each year	56
Figure B1.6	Rate of homicide with a firearm has decreased more than the rate without	57
Figure B1.7	Proportion of robberies with firearms has decreased dramatically	57
Figure B1.8	Rate of robberies with a firearm decreased from 1991 to 2002	58
Figure B2.1	The relative use of incarceration in adult court remains stable as orders for probation and conditional sentences grow and fines decline	61
Figure B2.2	The relative use of probation as the most serious sentence in youth court convictions has been growing	65
Figure B2.3	Over the last five years, the average length of adult custodial sentences has declined	69
Figure B2.4	Mean and median prison terms imposed in adult courts vary across the country, 2003/04	70
Figure B2.5	The mean length of probation terms in adult court gradually declined between 1995/96 and 2003/04	71
Figure B2.6	Fines ordered in adult courts have become more costly	72
Figure B2.7	Mean length of youth custody sentences declined under the <i>Young Offenders Act</i> , especially for secure custody	73
Figure B2.8	Youth court fines fairly stable in recent years, but higher than 12 years ago	75
Figure B2.9	Canada among western countries whose incarceration rates have declined between 1993 to 2001	77
Figure B3.1	Police clearance rates for violent and property crime have decreased just slightly since the early 1990s	84
Figure B3.2	Clearance rates for total <i>Criminal Code</i> incidents (excluding traffic violations), Canada, the provinces and territories, 2004	85
Figure B3.3	Clearance rates for violent crimes, Canada, the provinces and territories, 2004	86
Figure B3.4	Clearance rates for property crimes, Canada, the provinces and territories, 2004	86
Figure B3.5	The average elapsed time for case processing in youth court and adult criminal court has grown	87
Figure B3.6	Average elapsed time for case processing in adult court, by reporting jurisdictions, 2003/04	88
Figure B3.7	Average elapsed time for case processing in youth court, Canada, provinces and territories, 2003/04	89
Figure B4.1	Number of legal aid applications is declining slightly	91
Figure B5.1	Number of victim service agencies, by province and territory, 2002/03	98
Figure B5.2	Number of shelters, by province and territory, 2003/04	98
Figure B5.3	Number of residential services for abused women growing slowly	99
Figure B5.4	Number of peace bonds issued in selected jurisdictions has double in a decade	103
Figure B5.5	Number of adult criminal court convictions resulting in restitution fewer than a decade ago	105
Figure B5.6	Number of youth court convictions resulting in an order of restitution or other types of compensation has been generally declining since 1997/98	106

Context of crime

Figure C1.1	Rate of property and violent crime highest among young people, 2003	122
Figure C1.2	Comparison over time in rates of property crime and population accounted for by age groups, 1962 to 2004	123
Figure C1.3	Comparison over time in rates of violent crime and population accounted for by age groups, 1962 to 2004	123

Figure C1.4	Populations in western provinces are younger and crime rates higher, 2004	124
Figure C1.5	Aboriginal population younger than the non-Aboriginal population, 2001	125
Figure C1.6	Aboriginal populations are youngest in Saskatchewan, Nunavut and Manitoba, 2001	126
Figure C1.7	Canada's immigrant population accounts for the highest proportion of the population in 70 years	127
Figure C1.8	Immigrants are increasingly from Asia and the Middle East	128
Figure C1.9	The Gross Domestic Product has steadily increased since the early 1990s	129
Figure C1.10	Comparison over time of rates of property crime and inflation, 1962 to 2004	130
Figure C1.11	Comparison over time of rates of violent crime and inflation, 1962 to 2004	131
Figure C1.12	Average after-tax annual income for families and unattached individuals increased since 1996	132
Figure C1.13	Proportion of persons living below the low-income cut-off has decreased since 1996, but seniors have experienced a steady decrease over the long term	133
Figure C1.14	Lone-parent families most likely to live below the low-income cut-off, 2003	133
Figure C1.15	Despite decreasing since the mid-1990s, the percentage of families under the low-income cut-off continues to be highest among lone parent families	134
Figure C1.16	Sales and service jobs most common in the Canadian population, 2002	135
Figure C1.17	One in three women working in sales and service sector jobs, 2002	136
Figure C1.18	Comparison over time in rates of property crime and unemployment, 1962 to 2004	137
Figure C1.19	Comparison over time in rates of violent crime and unemployment, 1962 to 2004	137
Figure C1.20	Average government transfers remained unchanged in 2003	139
Figure C1.21	Income inequality, as measured by the Gini coefficient for after-tax income, relatively stable in 2003	141
Figure C1.22	Census Metropolitan Area growth rates, 1996 to 2001	142
Figure C1.23	Race/ethnicity most common target of hate-motivated crime, 2001-2002	150
Figure C1.24	Jewish most likely target of hate-motivated crimes, 2001-2002	151
Figure C1.25	Blacks most worried among visible minority groups about being targeted for an ethno-cultural hate-motivated crime	152
Figure C2.1	Families headed by married couples still account for the majority of families, but other types of families are growing	153
Figure C2.2	Percentage of children living with parents in common-law unions and within lone-parent families is increasing	154
Figure C2.3	Number of marriages and divorces in Canada, 1921 to 2002	156
Figure C2.4	Spousal violence trends, 5-year rates, 1999 and 2004	159
Figure C2.5	Rates of spousal violence highest in the West, past 5 years, 2004	160
Figure C2.6	Females under 18 years old are more likely than males to be victimized by a family member	162
Figure C2.7	Senior victims of violence by family members were most frequently victimized by adult children, 2003	163
Figure C2.8	Rate of family violence against seniors as reported to a subset of police departments still higher than five years ago	164
Figure C2.9	Alcohol abuse elevates risk of spousal violence, 2004	165
Figure C3.1	Average employment income and earning potential higher among university graduates	167
Figure C3.2	Canadians are attaining higher levels of schooling	167
Figure C3.3	Young Canadians have higher levels of document literacy than older age groups, 2004	169
Figure C3.4	Regular heavy drinking is most prevalent among young males, 2003	172
Figure C3.5	Mental health disorders more common for women than men, 2002	173
Figure C3.6	Boys are more self-confident than girls	175

Introduction

In order to improve the delivery of justice services to the public, many jurisdictions are developing high-level indicators on the state of the criminal justice system. Indicators are useful tools that can help identify problem areas, develop public policy, evaluate programs and generally monitor the overall “health” of the justice system. In response to a request for justice indicators information from the Deputy Ministers responsible for justice, representatives from the federal, provincial and territorial ministries with justice responsibility, along with the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, developed a number of indicators to measure the workload and performance of the justice system, as well as the context in which crime and victimization can occur. The objective of this present report is to present data on the prime workload, performance and context of crime indicators. While most data are presented at the national level, some analysis at the provincial and territorial levels is included.

Defining indicators

Workload and volume indicators

Workload and volume indicators are sector-specific measures of the activity or workload that takes place in various components of the justice system. In this report, workload and volume measures centre on the work of the police, courts, corrections, diversion programs and victim services, and changes over time. Examples of workload and volume indicators examined in this report include: the number of criminal incidents known to police; the number of people participating in alternative measures, mediation, dispute resolution and diversion programs; the number of cases dealt with in court; average counts in correctional institutions; and, the number of persons assisted by victim service agencies.

Performance indicators

Performance indicators provide information useful in assessing how the components of the criminal justice system and the system overall are performing. Performance measures are most useful when placed in the context of goals or outcomes of the criminal justice system. Performance indicators in this report are organized according to the following five general goals of the criminal justice system which were developed and agreed upon by the ministries responsible for justice: 1) Public order, safety and national security through prevention and intervention; 2) Offender accountability, reintegration and rehabilitation; 3) Public trust, confidence and respect for the justice system; 4) Social equity and access to the justice system for all citizens; and, 5) Victim needs served. Examples of performance indicators examined in this report are: the overall cost of administering the sectors of the criminal justice system; the type and length of sentences ordered in court; public satisfaction with the police, the courts, and the correctional and parole systems; the number of applications for legal aid; and, the number of services for victims of crime.

Context of crime

The criminal justice system does not act in isolation from other social systems or conditions and therefore crime should be viewed within a broader social context. Understanding outcomes, such as crime, victimization and re-offending, and reasons for their occurrence requires information on both justice and partner system interventions (e.g., those of the education, social-welfare and health sectors), as well as individual, family and community influences. Recently, by building on previous work on performance indicators and with the assistance of a committee of academics, the justice community developed a *Data Framework for Justice Statistics and Analysis* (Appendix D), which identifies factors and systems interventions that can affect outcomes. It also identifies outcomes that extend beyond the criminal justice system and touch on broader areas of economic and social functioning. The purpose of the framework is to guide the development of information that will contribute to a better understanding of how policies, programs and procedures are operating, what is working and not working, for whom and why.

This framework offers a number of socio-economic and demographic indicators to provide context to crime. The *Context of crime* section in this report takes into account broader “environmental” contexts that may contribute to crime, victimization or conflict, as well as a range of factors in individuals’ backgrounds and life experiences that may influence these events. The indicators in this section are organized into three broad categories: *Community and society*, *Family*, and *Individual*. Examples of “context of crime” indicators examined in this report include: the age and sex distributions of the population; income levels and labour force participation; levels of social engagement; levels of gang activity; family structures; levels of child support; levels of education; the rate of literacy; and, the rate of alcohol and drug abuse among the adult and youth population.

A. Prime workload indicators

Workload indicators include some of the most basic and widely-used measures in the criminal justice system. They describe the amount of activity that takes place throughout the various components of the system, and are often interpreted as reflecting the level of criminal activity in society and how this level changes over time. They are important to policy makers because of their potential to influence public opinion of the effectiveness of the justice system and perceptions of personal and public safety. They are frequently used by policy makers and planners, together with performance indicators, to chart changes in the nature and extent of crime and the workload of the justice system. Examples include the type and volume of criminal incidents reported to the police, the number of cases dealt with in adult and youth court, the number of admissions to federal and provincial institutions, and the number of people assisted by victim services.

A1. Workload of police¹

The workload of police is largely influenced by the level of crime. While the nature of police work has evolved to include activities such as community policing and crime prevention, the majority of police work can still be characterized as reactive. In other words, police respond to public calls when a crime has occurred or is in the process of being committed. Even calls for service that are eventually determined to be “unfounded” (meaning a crime did not in fact occur) require police resources for an initial investigation. However, the changing nature of crime can place additional demands on police. For instance, with the advancement of technology and increased globalization, the investigation of certain crimes is becoming more complex. However, it is difficult to measure nationally the complexity of cases that come to the attention of police in order to understand empirically their effect on police workload. Therefore, in terms of measurable indicators, changes in police workload can be linked to trends in the number of calls for service as well as changes in the number, rate, and type of criminal incidents recorded by police and the number of police available to respond to these crimes.

A1.1 Calls to police for service

Calls to police for service can include a broad range of requests for police assistance, such as assistance at traffic accidents, breaches of security alarms and response to other situations which, after investigation, may be determined as a non-criminal incident. These calls all contribute to the workload of officers. However, data on changes in the number of calls to police for service are currently unavailable. While individual police services may track these counts to measure their respective workloads, there is currently no national program to collect these data in a standardized way.

A1.2 Criminal incidents known to police²

Crime rates have generally been declining


Criminal incidents known to police are incidents that, after investigation, are substantiated by police as actual crimes. In 2004, there were more than 2.5 million

Criminal Code incidents (non-traffic) reported by police, including about 302,300 violent incidents, over 1.2 million property crimes and almost 1 million 'other *Criminal Code*' offences (Table A1.1).³ That year, the national crime rate of 8,051 incidents per 100,000 population decreased slightly (-1%) from 2003 when Canada witnessed its first increase in over a decade (Figure A1.1). The decrease in 2004 was driven largely by a 5% decline in Ontario. Overall, the rate of violent crime fell by 2% and property crime dipped 3%. The rate of 'other *Criminal Code*' offences grew by 2%.

Since 1994, the rate of police-reported incidents has generally declined in most major crime categories (Figure A1.1). Although the police-reported crime rate in 2004 was 13% lower than a decade earlier, it was still 5% higher than the rate recorded 25 years ago. Compared to 1994, the rate of property crimes (which normally account for about half of all reported offences) was 24% lower in 2004. Violent crimes usually account for roughly one in ten reported crimes, but due to their nature, often require more intensive investigation than other crimes. From 1994 to 2004, the rate of violent crimes decreased by 10%. Contrary to these declines, 'other *Criminal Code*' offences, such as mischief, prostitution, arson, weapons offences, counterfeit currency, disturbing the peace, and probation and bail violations, increased by 10% over the last decade. These 'other *Criminal Code*' incidents typically account for almost four in ten crimes.

Figure A1.1

Police-reported rate of violent crime stable while 'other *Criminal Code*' offences on the rise, 1977 to 2004¹



1. Population estimates come from the *Annual Demographic Statistics, 2004* report, produced by Statistics Canada, Demography Division. Populations as of July 1st: preliminary postcensal estimates for 2004.


2. 'Other' *Criminal Code* offences include: mischief, counterfeit currency, disturbing the peace, bail violations, offensive weapons, arson, obstructing a public or peace officers, indecent acts, prostitution and trespassing at night.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Crime rates tend to be higher in the western provinces

Among the provinces, crime rates have historically increased from east to west in Canada (Figure A1.2). However, in recent years there have been exceptions to this general pattern. For instance, in 2004, rates of violent crime and 'other *Criminal Code*' offences in Ontario and Quebec were the lowest in Canada (Figures A1.3 and A1.5). These two provinces also reported lower rates of property crime than Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island (Figure A1.4).


Figure A1.2
Police-reported crime rate highest in Saskatchewan and the territories, 2004¹



1. Population estimates come from the *Annual Demographic Statistics, 2004* report, produced by Statistics Canada, Demography Division. Populations as of July 1st: preliminary postcensal estimates for 2004.
2. Crime data from April to December 2004 for Winnipeg are estimates (except for homicide and motor vehicle theft) due to the implementation of a new records management system.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Figure A1.3
Saskatchewan reported the highest rate of violent crime among provinces in 2004¹




1. Population estimates come from the *Annual Demographic Statistics, 2004* report, produced by Statistics Canada, Demography Division. Populations as of July 1st: preliminary postcensal estimates for 2004.
2. Crime data from April to December 2004 for Winnipeg are estimates (except for homicide and motor vehicle theft) due to the implementation of a new records management system.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Figure A1.4

British Columbia reported the highest rate of property crime among provinces in 2004¹




1. Population estimates come from the *Annual Demographic Statistics, 2004* report, produced by Statistics Canada, Demography Division. Populations as of July 1st: preliminary postcensal estimates for 2004.
2. Crime data from April to December 2004 for Winnipeg are estimates (except for homicide and motor vehicle theft) due to the implementation of a new records management system.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Figure A1.5

Ontario reported the lowest rate of 'other Criminal Code' incidents among the provinces in 2004^{1,2}



1. Population estimates come from the *Annual Demographic Statistics, 2004* report, produced by Statistics Canada, Demography Division. Populations as of July 1st: preliminary postcensal estimates for 2004.
2. 'Other Criminal Code' offences include: mischief, counterfeit currency, disturbing the peace, bail violations, offensive weapons, arson, obstructing a public or peace officers, indecent acts, prostitution and trespassing at night.
3. Crime data from April to December 2004 for Winnipeg are estimates (except for homicide and motor vehicle theft) due to the implementation of a new records management system.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.


Four jurisdictions reported decreases in their overall crime rate in 2004: Yukon Territory (-13%), Prince Edward Island (-6%), Ontario (-5%) and Saskatchewan (-2%). Looking at a longer time period, all provinces except Ontario (-51%), British Columbia (-12%) and Quebec (-9%) have seen increases compared to a decade ago. The largest increase in crime rates over the past decade has been reported by Saskatchewan, up 29% compared to 1994. Increases in the other provinces ranged from 6% in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to 14% in Prince Edward Island.

Homicide as a measure of police workload⁴

Homicide is a serious criminal offence that requires greater police time and resources compared to most other offences. The *Criminal Code* classifies homicide as first degree murder, second degree murder, manslaughter or infanticide. Police investigation, processing of the accused and court appearances are some elements of police work that tend to be more extensive for homicide incidents than for other types of crimes. Therefore, fluctuations in homicides can be one indicator of police workload.

The national homicide rate has generally been declining since the mid-1970s, but after reaching its lowest point in more than three decades in 2003, it rose 12% in 2004 to a rate of 1.9 victims per 100,000 population. The actual number of homicides grew from 549 in 2003 to 622 in 2004, an increase of 73 homicides (Figure A1.6). Most of the increase in the number of homicides was fuelled by increases in five of Canada's nine largest Census Metropolitan Areas: Winnipeg (+16), Edmonton (+12), Vancouver (+11), Calgary (+9) and Montreal (+7). The majority of provinces and territories reported increases: Alberta (+22), British Columbia (+18), Quebec (+12), Ontario (+9), Manitoba (+7), the Yukon Territory (+6), Nova Scotia (+5), and Nunavut (+1). Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick each reported a decrease of one homicide while Newfoundland and Labrador saw three fewer homicides in 2004. The number of the Northwest Territories remained unchanged.

Figure A1.6
Number of homicides¹ increased 13 percent in 2004




1. As a result of ongoing investigations in Port Coquitlam, B.C., there were 15 homicides included in 2002, 6 homicides in 2003 and 5 homicides in 2004 that occurred in previous years. Homicides are counted according to the year in which police file the report.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Homicide Survey.

As has been the case historically, the four western provinces reported homicide rates that were higher than the Canadian average (Figure A1.7). In 2004, Manitoba had the highest rate with 4.3 homicides per 100,000 population, followed by Saskatchewan at 3.9 homicides per 100,000 population. Rates in the three territories tend to be much higher than the provinces.

Figure A1.7
Among the provinces, Manitoba reported the highest homicide rate in 2004¹




1. Population estimates come from the *Annual Demographic Statistics, 2004* report, produced by Statistics Canada, Demography Division. Populations as of July 1st: preliminary postcensal estimates for 2004.
2. As a result of ongoing investigations in Port Coquitlam, B.C., there were 5 homicides in 2004 that occurred in previous years. Homicides are counted according to the year in which police file the report.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Homicide Survey.

A1.3 Criminal incidents per police officer


Since police work is largely focused on responding to criminal incidents, an appropriate indicator of police workload relates to changes in the number of criminal incidents per police officer. The rate is affected not only by changes in the number of crimes reported to the police in a given year, but also by the number of police officers available to respond to criminal incidents.

In 2003, there were 43 *Criminal Code* incidents per police officer in Canada, an increase of 5% from 41 incidents per officer in the previous year (Figure A1.8). Despite this recent growth, the ratio of incidents to police officers has generally been declining since 1991. Prior to 1991, the number of incidents per police officer steadily moved upward for almost two decades. Trends in the number of incidents per police officer generally follow the trends in the crime rate. Specifically, the decline in the number of incidents per officer since 1991 was more a result of a decreasing volume of incidents than increases in the number of police personnel.

Figure A1.8**The number of criminal incidents per police officer has generally been declining since 1991**

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Police Administration Survey and Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

As a result of being among the provinces with the lowest crime rates in the country and the highest ratio of police officers relative to their provincial populations, Ontario (32) and Quebec (33) reported the lowest number of criminal incidents per police officer in 2003 (Figure A1.9). Only New Brunswick and Newfoundland and Labrador joined these two provinces in reporting rates below the national average. Also in keeping with patterns of reported crime rates, the western provinces reported the highest number of criminal incidents per police officer. For example, in 2003, there were 77 criminal incidents for every officer in Saskatchewan and 72 per officer in British Columbia. Alberta and Manitoba followed with rates of 65 and 64 incidents per officer, respectively.

Figure A1.9**Among the provinces, number of criminal incidents per police officer were highest in the western provinces, 2003**

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Police Administration Survey and Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Since regional variations in the number of incidents per officer is largely influenced by the volume of reported crimes, factors affecting the rate of reported crime are important considerations in explaining geographic differences. For example, policies directing officers on when to apply discretion and divert persons will vary by province and territory. Consequently, when comparing regions, it is necessary to take into account that the number of criminal incidents only includes offences recorded by police and does not include all incidents that occupy police time.

A2. Workload of diversion programs

A2.1 Number of people served by alternative measures, mediation, dispute resolution and diversionary programs

Diversion and alternative measures programs are non-judicial alternatives to the traditional, formal criminal justice process. These programs can be applied by criminal justice officials at various stages of the criminal justice system, from the point of police contact through to sentencing. Counts of the number of adults and youths diverted by police and taking part in diversion or alternative measures programs are an indicator of workload for the police and these programs. It should be noted, however, that such programs are administered differently from one jurisdiction to another and these differences can include variations in the types and number of programs available and the requirements to render an individual eligible for alternative measures. As such, inter-jurisdictional comparisons of data should be made with caution.

Historically, police have used discretion to divert persons out of the court system, particularly when an alleged incident was relatively minor and involved a first-time offender or youth⁵, and when formal charges and court proceeding are not considered the most beneficial approach. An indicator of the workload of police in applying diversion is the number of adults and youths apprehended and diverted. Currently, data on this indicator are not available nationally, but will be available for youth in the future.

Diversion programs have also been formalized for both youths and adults. Up to April 1, 2003, the *Young Offenders Act (YOA)*, the legislation governing the youth criminal justice system, provided for alternative measures. These measures were administered by the Crown and the legislation required youths to accept responsibility for the offence and agree to participate in a designated program. On April 1, 2003, this legislation was replaced with the *Youth Criminal Justice Act*. Under the new legislation, alternative measures have been incorporated under the extrajudicial measures scheme, which aims to provide greater guidance on the use, type and objectives of diversion. Alternative measures for youths are currently known as extrajudicial sanctions. Other diversionary measures have been included in the legislation, namely police warnings and referrals, and Crown cautions.

The proclamation of *Bill C-41* in 1996 established an alternative measures program for adults. These programs are authorized under section 717 of the *Criminal Code*. Examples of formal diversion programs include community service, personal service or financial compensation to the victim, and apologies. Depending on the province or territory, the work of delivering formal diversion programs to adults or youth is carried out by three types of agencies: governmental agencies (e.g., probation services), non-governmental organizations, and Youth Justice Committees. A prime indicator of the volume of work among these agencies is the number of persons participating in the programs. Data for youths come from the Alternative Measures Survey, which is conducted annually, while information on adults in alternative measures program is only available for 1998/99 through a special one-time survey.

Under the restorative justice approach, another form of diversion applied by police and the Crown is mediation (also known as dispute resolution or victim-offender reconciliation).⁶ This diversionary measure aims to restore the loss experienced by the victim and repair any harm. It involves the accused, victim, and neutral mediator in facilitating sharing and negotiating restitution. Some may also involve community members, family of the accused and the victim. While the type of restitution varies, it may involve financial compensation or another service either to the victim or the community. At the present time, data on the prevalence of mediation are not nationally available.

Number of youths participating in alternative measures is lower compared to five years earlier


Among the jurisdictions that provided data to the Alternative Measures Survey, about 24,500 youths were assigned to alternative measures in 2002/03.⁷ This number is 8% higher than in 2001/02, but 9% lower than in 1997/98⁸, the year data collection began (Table A2.1). Almost all jurisdictions experienced decreases since 1997/98.

Rates permit a different perspective of workload by controlling for variations in populations.⁹ In 2002/03, the relative workload of agencies responsible for the delivery of youth alternative measures was highest in the Northwest Territories for the second year in a row, with 401 youths participating in alternative measures per 10,000 youth. The Yukon Territory had the second highest rate with 315 per 10,000 youth, followed by Saskatchewan (285) and Alberta (244). As youth alternative measure programs are administered differently from one jurisdiction to another, there are a number of factors that can influence these rates. However, it is notable that in 2003 the Northwest Territories, the Yukon Territory and Saskatchewan also recorded youth crime rates that were substantially higher than rates for the rest of the provinces. Further, in 2002/03, the rate of youth court cases, expressed as the number of youth cases per 10,000 youth aged 12 to 17 years, was also high in these jurisdictions. In 2002/03, Newfoundland and Labrador had the lowest participation rate among the reporting jurisdictions with complete data (100 youth participating in alternative measures per 10,000 youth).¹⁰

Community service most common alternative measure for youth

The type of alternative measure determines the nature and amount of commitment the agency administering the alternative measures program must invest in the youth. For instance, personal service and community service orders can range in duration from 1 hour to 240 hours. In contrast, an apology to the victim is often a single event.

In 2002/03, about 8,200 (30%) of the roughly 27,000 alternative measures administered to youth were community service orders.¹¹ The next most common types were a verbal or written apology (17%) and social skills improvement (15%) (Figure A2.1). Counselling (3%), essay/presentation (2%), education program (2%), personal service (2%), referral (less than 1%) and supervision by a probation officer (less than 1%) were the least frequently assigned interventions for youths. This distribution is similar to 2001/02.

Figure A2.1**Community service order most common alternative measures administered to youth among reporting jurisdictions¹, 2002/03**

1. Program admissions data are available for Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and Northwest Territories.
 Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Alternative Measures Survey.

Aside from community service orders which were either the first or second most frequent alternative measure in every jurisdiction, jurisdictional variation existed in the type of alternative measure. Youths were given an order to apologize in all jurisdictions except Quebec. Social skills improvement represented 38% of Quebec alternative measures, but only accounted for 2% of alternative measures in the Northwest Territories and none in the remaining four reporting jurisdictions.

Most community service orders assigned to youth are under 50 hours

As previously mentioned, the amount of time that a youth is assigned to an intervention can have an impact on workload. In a study of 1998/99 data, 94% of youth were assigned less than 50 hours of community service among the reporting jurisdictions. The same is also true for youths assigned to personal service.

Supervision most frequently administered to adults

Previous research on patterns of adults' participation in alternative measures for five provinces revealed that, unlike the youth system, supervision by a probation officer was the most common type of intervention (Engler and Crowe, 2000).¹² In 1998/99, 44% of adults in five provinces were assigned to supervision, 19% to apologies, and 12% to community service.

A3. Workload of criminal courts

One of the key indicators of the workload of the criminal courts is the number of adult and youth cases heard in court. Known as criminal court caseload, this indicator focuses on the “case” as the primary unit of analysis, which is defined as one or more charges against an individual and disposed of in court on the same day. Data on this indicator can provide an understanding of the shifts that may be occurring in the workload of courts, as well as workload variations among the jurisdictions.

Other measures also explain the amount of work taking place in the adult and youth court systems. For example, the number of court appearances per case is an important measure of workload, as numerous court appearances result in greater demands on the court than a single appearance. Therefore, any changes to this indicator signal shifts in the workload of the court system.


A closely related indicator is the average elapsed time from first to last court appearance. The number of cases that proceed to trial, compared to those that end with a guilty plea or are stayed, withdrawn or dealt with in another manner also serves as a workload indicator of the courts, as trial cases often result in a much higher workload for the courts than other types of decisions. Also, findings of guilt are indicative of future work of the court system in terms of processing and sentencing.

A3.1 Number of cases dealt with in youth courts

Since 1991/92, the first year for which national youth court data are available, the number of cases processed through youth criminal courts has fallen. The youth court system heard 70,465 cases in 2003/04, a 17% decline from the previous year and a 33% drop since 1991/92 (Figure A3.1). This downward trend is mainly the result of fewer cases of crimes against property appearing in youth criminal courts. The decrease in 2003/04, however, is largely attributable to the introduction of the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* in April 2003, legislation which is aimed at reducing the use of youth courts for less serious offences.¹³ The decline in 2003/04 also represents the largest single annual decline during this period (Thomas, 2005).


The rate of youth court cases varies considerably from one jurisdiction to another

Differences in public reporting to police, procedures and eligibility requirements for police diversion, and provincial/territorial policy on Crown discretion contribute to significant inter-jurisdictional differences in the volume of the youth caseload (Thomas, 2005). One example of these policy-related influences include such processes as mandatory pre-charge screening in New Brunswick, Quebec, and British Columbia, which aim to divert less serious cases out of court and reduce court workload.

Figure A3.1**Number of youth cases has been generally decreasing since 1991/92**

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Court Survey.

In 2003/04, case rates per 1,000 youth population were highest in Nunavut, Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories (Figure A3.2). The lowest caseload rates were reported by Quebec (15), Prince Edward Island (18) and British Columbia (18).

Figure A3.2**Youth case rates¹ highest in Nunavut, 2003/04**

1. Population estimates come from the *Annual Demographic Statistics, 2004* report, produced by Statistics Canada, Demography Division. Populations as of July 1st: updated postcensal estimates for 2003.
2. Rates of cases may be underreported for Nunavut, as there may be charge and case information from remote areas that is entered into their caseload management system several months after sending data submission to the Youth Court Survey.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Court Survey.

Longer case completion may translate into greater workload for the court system, as it may signal a growth in the number of trial cases, complex cases, serious offences, and/or a backlog of cases. Elapsed time may also be related to the co-ordination and availability of various participants in the court process, lawyers' decisions on the most appropriate course of action for their clients, and the accused failing to appear. For information on the length of time for youth court processing and on case complexity, refer to Section B3.4 of this report.

Guilty verdicts in youth court are decreasing slightly

The number of guilty verdicts can also have an impact on the workload of the courts as there are a number of steps that follow this type of verdict, such as a sentencing hearing and other administrative requirements. In 2003/04, almost six in ten youth court cases (57%) ended in a finding of guilt. Although the proportion was relatively stable from the previous year, it was seven percentage points lower than the high of 64% in 1998/99. Each year since 1998/99, the likelihood of a finding of guilt has slightly decreased. This has been primarily fuelled by a decrease in guilty findings for property offences.

Regional variations in the proportion of guilty findings are also evident. This may be explained by jurisdictional differences in the use of diversion by police and the Crown, variations in charge approval standards and differences in the use of stays and withdrawals, all of which can influence the types of cases that appear before youth court. In 2003/04, guilty findings ranged from 36% of cases in the Yukon Territory to 73% of cases in New Brunswick.


A3.2 Number of cases dealt with in adult criminal court

After two years of increases, the number of cases heard in adult courts dropped in 2003/04

According to the Adult Criminal Court Survey, during 2003/04, there were 380,978 cases heard in adult criminal courts in the eight provinces and territories with trend data.¹⁴ This number marks the first decrease (-4%) after two years of increases (Figure A3.3). Although the number remains higher than the low recorded in 2000/01, it is still 13% below the 1994/95 caseload volume. The long downward trend in caseload volume between 1994/95 and 2000/01 generally corresponds to the pattern in police-reported crime statistics. According to the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey, the same eight jurisdictions that report adult criminal court data reported a 9% decrease in the number of adults charged by police between 1994 and 2003 (Thomas, 2004).


The rate of adult court cases is heaviest in the Yukon Territory

In examining adult criminal court case rates across the reporting jurisdictions, the Yukon Territory had the heaviest caseload, with 46 cases per 1,000 adult population (Figure A3.4). The next heaviest caseloads were recorded by Saskatchewan (36), Alberta (26) and Ontario (21). Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick appear to have the lightest caseload (16 each), followed by British Columbia (17). Factors such as a few large complex cases, the availability of human and other resources and the provision of services to vast, remote areas can have a considerable impact on the number of cases completed and may explain some of the differences between jurisdictions. It should be noted that Quebec's case rate (12) is affected by the absence of data for criminal cases heard in municipal courts.¹⁵

Figure A3.3**Number of cases heard in adult criminal courts dropped in 2003/04^{1,2,3}**

1. Due to missing data for some years, data on New Brunswick and the Northwest Territories have been excluded. Data on Manitoba and Nunavut are not currently available.
2. Data from some court locations in Quebec are not included. Information from Quebec's 87 municipal courts (which accounts for approximately one-quarter of federal statute charges in that province) is not collected.
3. Data from superior courts are only available for Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Alberta, British Columbia, and the Yukon.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.

Figure A3.4**Adult case rates per 1,000 population highest in the Yukon Territory, 2003/04^{1,2,3}**

1. Data are not available for Manitoba, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut. Population estimates come from the *Annual Demographic Statistics, 2003* report, produced by Statistics Canada, Demography Division. Populations as of July 1st: preliminary postcensal estimates for 2003.
2. Data from some court locations in Quebec are not included. Information from Quebec's 87 municipal courts (which accounts for approximately one-quarter of federal statute charges in that province) is not collected. Therefore, caution should be used when comparing Quebec's case rate with other jurisdictions.
3. Data from superior courts are only available for Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Alberta, British Columbia, and the Yukon.


Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.

Adult criminal court cases requiring more appearances and more time

The number of appearances in a case affects court workload as the offender’s presence is required at each appearance. Between 1994/95 and 2003/04, the average number of court appearances per case increased from four appearances in 1994/95 to six in 2003/04. Interpreted in a different way, exactly half (50%) of all adult cases took five or more appearances to complete in 2003/04. This compares to one-third (33%) of all cases in 1994/95 (Figure A3.5). The amount of time from the first to last court appearance has also risen, as has the number of cases with multiple charges. Together, these signal an indication of more complex cases and hence a heavier workload. For more information on changes in the length of time required to process cases in adult court and the number, refer to Section B3.4 of this report.

Figure A3.5

The proportion of cases with five or more appearances has grown since 1994/95¹



1. Due to missing data for some years, data on New Brunswick, British Columbia and the Northwest Territories have been excluded. Data on Manitoba and Nunavut are not currently available.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.

Majority of cases are dealt with outside of a trial

As a rule, cases take longer to complete when they proceed to trial. In 2003/04, less than one in ten adult court cases were completed at trial (Table A3.1). This is similar to previous years and essentially means that there has been no observable change in the proportion of adult cases heard in a trial setting.

Of those cases completed at trial, two-thirds (66%) resulted in a guilty finding. The remaining one-third of decisions were acquittals. Findings of guilt can be an indicator of workload since these are followed by other court tasks, such as sentencing hearings. Between 1994/95 to 2003/04, a guilty decision has become less common, decreasing from 78% of trial outcomes to 66%.

Trends in the outcome of non-trial cases have varied. The proportion of non-trial cases stayed or withdrawn has increased from 30% of cases in 1994/95 to 36% in 2003/04. In contrast, the proportion of adult cases with a guilty plea, which represented over half (57%) of all non-trial adult cases in 2003/04, has been relatively stable between 1994/95 and 2003/04. Other non-trial decisions¹⁶ have decreased during this same time period.

Box A3.1

Criminal prosecutions personnel

Similar to examining the number of criminal incidents per police officer, to better understand the workload of youth and adult criminal courts, it is important to examine trends in staffing. According to the Prosecutions Personnel and Expenditures Survey,¹ criminal prosecution branches employed 3,479 court personnel (full-time equivalents) in 2002/03. Of these, 60% were staff lawyers, 6% were prosecutorial support (paralegal and students), and 34% were other personnel, primarily clerical support. This staffing distribution was the same as in 2000/01.

Overall, there has been a 13% increase in court personnel between 2000/01 and 2002/03. This increase was driven by a growth in all court positions. Increases were also recorded in almost every jurisdiction, with the exception of Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island, which both experienced a drop of 8%.

1. Data are not available from British Columbia.

A4. Workload of the correctional system

In general, there are two key indicators that have been used to measure the workload of corrections: 1) the average count of persons on any given day; and 2) the number of annual admissions to correctional programs. Average counts serve as an operational measure of the day-to-day management of correctional programs, while admission data provide insight into the workload involved in processing and screening inmates into correctional services, whether it is a new admittance or a transfer from one type of program to another.

Each indicator has its limitations. Average counts are affected by the length of time in custody and in turn, offenders on probation, conditional sentence, or with longer prison terms are over-represented compared to statistics based on admissions. On the other hand, admissions data are not based on unique individuals in the correctional system and the same person may be counted several times when the individual moves from one correctional service to another.¹⁷

In addition to these conventional indicators, it is important to recognize other considerations that have a significant impact on correctional services workload, such as the amount of time spent with offenders, on administrative functions, and on training and professional development (Box A4.1).

Box A4.1

Conditions affecting the workload of corrections

The volume and nature of correctional work is intrinsically connected to the profile of the offender population. That is, the level of support, intervention or supervision is determined by the risks and needs of offenders in custody and in the community. These risks and criminogenic needs are assessed by examining a combination of factors, such as conviction histories, substance abuse problems, and employment stability. Logically, offenders deemed high risk to re-offend will require greater attention than those deemed a low risk. This often translates into targeted control and rehabilitation programs. According to a one-day snapshot of inmates in Canada's adult correctional facilities conducted in 1996, almost half (49%) of provincial/territorial sentenced inmates were deemed a high risk to re-offend (Trevethan et. al, 1999).

Apart from programs designed to reduce re-offending, security concerns and threats within institutions are other dimensions of the daily routine of correctional facilities. This work involves monitoring offender behaviour to ensure the safety and security of inmates and staff. Among the jurisdictions that reported to the one-day snapshot, some of the most common security concerns related to offender's substance abuse problems (23%) and assaultive or threatening behaviour (19%). Other examples included smuggling, institutional misconduct, and possession of contraband. Overall, it was found that inmates awaiting trial (i.e., on remand) posed more security concerns than sentenced inmates.

Changes in legislation and policy can also have a significant impact on the offender population in custody and in the community, which in turn, influences the volume of work. One example is the implementation of conditional sentences in 1996, which increased the number and type of adult offenders under community supervision, but has served to decrease the number of offenders in custody.

A4.1 Admissions to youth correctional institutions and average counts, by custody status

Correctional institutions for youths

The correctional supervision of young offenders (those aged 12 to 17) is the sole responsibility of the provinces and territories.¹⁸ The workload associated with operating youth correctional facilities can consist of preparing admission and other reports; directly supervising behaviour, work assignments, meals and recreations periods; escorting offenders in transit; meeting health care needs; and providing treatment and other programs. These tasks may also differ in intensity and type depending on the type of custody.

There are three types of custody under the youth justice system: secure custody, open custody, and custodial remand (also known as pre-trial detention). Secure custody includes facilities that provide secure containment or restraint of young offenders, while open custody generally refers to facilities where the use of security devices or perimeter security is minimal. Examples of open custody facilities include residential centres or group homes. For both secure and open custody, there are provincial/territorial differences in terms of the level of the restrictions imposed on youth in facilities.


The final type of youth custody is remand, where youths can be held in custody prior to their court hearing or sentencing. Reasons for the use of remand are similar to those for adults and can include the offender's danger to society or flight risk.

While the overall number of youths in custody has dropped, there has been a growth in the number of youth in custodial remand¹⁹

Among the reporting jurisdictions,²⁰ there were about 3,000 young offenders in some form of custody on an average day in 2002/03. This represents a decrease of 7% from the previous year and a drop of 28% since peaking in 1994/95 (Figure A4.1). Despite the overall drop, there have been variations during this period based on the type of custody. While sentenced custody has decreased over the last nine years (-37%), the number of youth on remand or pre-trial detention has steadily increased (+13%) from 753 youths in 1994/95 to 849 youths in 2002/03.

Figure A4.1

Sentenced custody for youth decreasing, while remand increasing, 1993/94 to 2002/03¹



1. Due to the unavailability of data, Ontario 12 to 15 year olds have been excluded.

2. Average daily counts, also referred to as actual-in counts, include youths on remand and temporary detention, sentenced offenders and other young offenders who are legally required to be at a custody facility and are present at the time the count is taken.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Corrections Key Indicator Report.


These dissimilar trends in sentenced custody and remand have influenced the general composition of youth corrections. Although the majority of youth custody caseload remains divided between secure (36%) and open custody (36%), the proportion of youth on remand has grown. In particular, 28% of the caseload of youth correctional facilities was devoted to remand in 2002/03, compared to 18% in 1993/94 (Table A4.1).

There are a number of possible consequences of the changing custody status of the corrections population. The workload of remand is relatively high given the demands and risks associated with persons detained (Johnson, 2003). Awaiting trial requires the frequent travel of remanded persons to and from the court. Also, the remand person's stress related to the uncertainty of their case, in addition to the unresolved nature of personal circumstances, such as mental illness and drug/alcohol abuse, can place additional strain on the day-to-day operations of corrections. This combined with the fact that rewards for good behaviour, which are traditionally accessible to sentenced offenders, such as remission and granting of temporary absence passes, are not available as incentives. The *Youth Criminal Justice Act* aims to restrict the use of remand through legislative criteria restricting the use of such detention (*YCJA*, s. 29).

Remand accounts for majority of youth custody admissions²¹

Trends in admissions to youth custody complement the findings above which show a greater presence of youth in custody for remand. Overall, data on admissions show that youth correctional services processed fewer youths into custody in 2002/03 than in the previous five years²² (Figure A4.2). More specifically, the number was 18% lower than in 1997/98, the year data collection began. While this decrease was driven by both admissions to sentenced custody and remand detention, the level of decline in sentenced custody (-29%) was over two and half times greater than that of remand custody (-11%). In comparison to the previous year, admissions to remand detention dipped 5%, with admissions to secure (-6%) and open custody (-7%) decreasing at similar rates.

Figure A4.2
Admissions to youth custody on the decline¹



1. Due to the unavailability of data, remand and sentenced custody admissions exclude all of Saskatchewan and Ontario youths aged 12 to 15. YCCS units of count for Alberta and Newfoundland and Labrador have been tabulated from micro-data based on standardized definitions that may differ from those being applied locally. In Alberta, there are substantial methodological differences such that these statistics cannot be reproduced by Alberta Correctional Services. Accordingly, caution should be used when comparing statistics for these jurisdictions against similar statistics that have been generated by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Custody and Community Services survey.

Admission data further reveal that three out of five youths admitted to custody were admitted to remand. The rate of remand admissions varied by province and territory and ranged from 77% of admissions in Manitoba to 18% of admissions in the Northwest Territories.

A4.2 Admissions to adult correctional institutions and average counts, by custody status

For adult offenders, the workload of correctional institutions is split between the federal and provincial/territorial governments. One aspect of this division is determined by the length of the custodial sentence imposed. Offenders sentenced to prison for a period of two years or more fall under federal jurisdiction, while offenders sentenced to prison for under two years are the responsibility of the provinces and territories. Additionally, the provinces and territories are responsible for detention under remand and other forms of temporary detention (e.g., immigration holds).

Remands comprise just under half of the corrections population in provincial or territorial custody


On an average day in 2002/03, there were approximately 32,000 adults in custody, of which over 19,000 were in provincial/territorial custody and just under 13,000 were incarcerated in federal institutions.²³ Within the incarcerated population under provincial or territorial jurisdiction, just over 9,000 adults, or 45%, were in remand.

The type and level of work, particularly the amount of supervision, can also vary by the level of security. A snapshot of the federal offender population on April 11, 2004 reveals that 15% of federal inmates were classified at maximum security levels, 65% at medium and 20% at minimum (Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada, 2004).

The number of inmates in custody to serve a sentence is now greater in federal institutions than in provincial/territorial institutions

Overall, the average daily count of the adult correctional population serving a custodial sentence has decreased since the mid-1990s, after increasing for almost ten years. While this drop occurred for both provincial/territorial and federal institutions, the decrease was greater for the provinces and territories (Figure A4.3). In particular, the decline in the provincially/territorially sentenced population began earlier than the drop in federal institutions (1995/96 compared to 1997/98) and declined an average of 3% per year since peaking in 1994/95, compared to an average annual decrease of 2% in the federally sentenced population following its peak in 1996/97.

These variations in the onset of the downward trends and in the rate of decrease have resulted in the size of the sentenced federal prison population surpassing the sentenced population in provincial/territorial institutions. On any given day in 2002/03, there was an average of 12,838 inmates in federal facilities serving sentences compared to 10,344 in provincial/territorial facilities (Figure A4.3). This contrasts the pattern prior to 1996/97 when more sentenced adults were incarcerated in provincial/territorial institutions than in federal institutions. Research has suggested that federal inmates have substantially higher levels of needs and therefore, may require greater attention and programming (Trevethan et. al. 1999).

Figure A4.3**Number of sentenced inmates in adult correctional institutions is on the decline^{1,2}**

1. The average daily count of offenders in custody is a measure of the number of persons present on the day of the count.

2. Due to missing data for some years, provincial/territorial data exclude the Northwest Territories and Nunavut.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Correctional Services Survey.

There are different explanations for the drop in counts for federally and provincially/territorially sentenced offenders. First, the decrease in crime in Canada can influence the number of persons sentenced to custody. During the 1990s, the number of criminal incidents in Canada began to decrease. Declines were seen in both serious offences that would have an impact on the number of sentences to federal custody, as well as less serious offences that would influence the number of sentences to provincial or territorial custody. Second, in both the provincial/territorial and federal systems, the length of sentences has been decreasing which can affect trends in the average counts of sentenced offenders (Johnson, 2004). Third, in terms of provincial and territorial institutions, policy shifts aimed at reducing the incarceration rate contributes, at least in part, to changes in the incarcerated population. One such example is the creation of conditional sentencing in 1996, which serves as an alternative to incarceration in cases where a sentence of imprisonment of less than two years would be appropriate.²⁴ A third factor that may explain the decrease in counts for offenders sentenced to provincial or territorial custody is the judiciary's consideration of time already served by the offender while in remand.


Rise in pre-trial detention places additional demands on provincial/territorial corrections

In terms of provincial/territorial corrections, trends in sentenced and remand populations have moved in opposite directions. Over the past ten years, the sentenced population dropped 27%, whereas the remand and temporary detention population jumped 69% (Figure A4.4). The growth in the number of adults on remand and temporary detention was the case for all jurisdictions with the exception of the Yukon Territory, where counts have been relatively stable.

Numerous factors may explain the increase in remand, including changes in laws or their interpretation (resulting from evolving case law and *Criminal Code* modifications in 1997²⁵), increased levels of violent crime offenders compared to non-violent offenders, longer court processing times which lead to increased durations of remand, and the use of "time served" sentences (Johnson, 2003).

Figure A4.4

Average daily count of adults in remand and other temporary detention increasing, 1978/79 to 2002/03^{1,2,3,4}



1. The average daily count of offenders in custody is a measure of the number of persons present on the day of the count.
 2. British Columbia changed reporting practices in 1999/00 to include other/temporary detention in remand.
 3. New Brunswick data for 2000/01 are extracted from a new operational system; therefore, caution is recommended when making comparisons over time.
 4. Due to missing data for some years, provincial/territorial data exclude the Northwest Territories and Nunavut.
- Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Correctional Services Survey.

The increase in the average count of adults in remand has been identified as a source of concern for correctional service administrators (Johnson, 2003). These administrative issues are similar to those affecting the remand detention of youths. They include such demands and risks as the frequent transport of remand persons to and from the court, as well as strain caused by the uncertain nature of remand or the unresolved nature of a person's circumstances, such as drug or alcohol dependency.

As with youth corrections, the composition of adult corrections has shifted as an outcome of the divergent trends in the sentenced and remand populations. Sentenced inmates now represent a little more than half (56%) of the provincial/territorial population, compared to almost three-quarters (73%) in 1993/94 (Figure A4.4).

Sentenced admissions decreasing for both federal and provincial and territorial facilities

In 2002/03, there were about 226,000 provincial and territorial admissions to custody and about 7,600 admissions into federal institutions (Table A4.2).²⁶ Remand and temporary detention accounted for two-thirds of admissions to provincial/territorial institutions.

Administrators in both the federal and provincial/territorial sectors have witnessed a long-term decline in the number of sentenced admissions, despite some annual fluctuations. In particular, the 7,600 admissions to federal institutions in 2002/03 represented a 23% drop from the peak recorded in 1993/94. The 78,000 sentenced admissions to provincial/territorial facilities in 2002/03 marked a 31% decrease from the peak in 1992/93. This contrasts the number of admissions to remand and other temporary detention in those provinces and territories, which has increased 32% over the last nine years.

In 2002/03, just over half (55%) of the 7,659 admissions to federal institutions were for warrant of committal, followed by revocation of conditional release (43%) or other reasons (2%).


Box A4.2

Personnel in adult correctional facilities

The day-to-day operation of adult correctional facilities requires a range of personnel, including correctional service officers, administrative support staff, instructors, program staff, health care workers and other personnel.¹ Changes in the number of these personnel can have a considerable impact on the workload for adult corrections. (While these types of changes can also affect the workload of those working with youth in detention, there are presently no national data on youth corrections personnel.)

Overall, the number of provincial/territorial employees in the adult correctional system has declined each year from 1999/00 to 2001/02, with a further 5% drop in 2002/03. This mirrors the decrease in the count of adult offenders under provincial/territorial custodial supervision. In comparison, the number of federal custody personnel has been generally increasing since 1992/93. During this period, the count of federal inmates increased until 1996/97 and has been decreasing since.

Number of federal custody personnel has been generally increasing^{1,2}



1. Unless otherwise specified, personnel reflects full-time equivalents (FTE's) as of March 31st, 2003.
 2. Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec - Staff figures represent budgeted person-years.
 Alberta - Personnel represents actual full-time employees at March 31, 2003.
Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Correctional Services Survey.

1. For instance, as of March 31, 2004, 53% of employees working in federal institutions were correctional officers, 17% administrative support, 8% health care workers, 6% parole officers, 4% program staff, 3% instructors/supervisors and 1% other workers such as trades people and food service workers (Public Security and Emergency Preparedness Canada. 2004 *Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview*. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services.)

Community supervision

Similar to custody, two key indicators are used to measure the workload of community corrections: the number of youths and adults under community supervision at a given point in time as measured by the average month-end counts, and the number of

admissions to community corrections.²⁷ These indicators are subject to the same limitations as the indicators for the population in custody (refer to Section A4 for more detail). Community supervision comprises dispositions, including probation and conditional sentences, as well as conditional releases, such as parole.

A term of probation can be handed down to both youth and adult offenders and compels offenders to comply with a number of conditions set by the court. Some conditions are present for all probation orders and include keeping the peace, being of good behaviour, and appearing before court as required. Other conditions are optional and left up to the court's discretion. These may include attending school, abstaining from alcohol or drug use, and reporting to a probation officer. In addition, probation is often used in combination with other sanctions, such as a fine or incarceration. Probation is the responsibility of the provinces and territories.

Conditional sentences can only be applied to adults. As indicated earlier, they were introduced in 1996 as an alternative to incarceration and can be imposed on offenders for a maximum of two years. As with probation, these offenders are the responsibility of the provincial and territorial governments. Conditional releases refer to adult offenders released to community supervision from custody after serving a period of incarceration. Responsibility for conditional releases falls under both federal and provincial jurisdictions, since offenders may be released on federal statutory release, federal parole, day parole or provincial parole.²⁸

In addition to the volume of the caseload, characteristics of the caseload also influence the level of work required. Characteristics of the caseload can include the type and amount of supervision the offender requires based on their risk of re-offending, their treatment, their educational or special needs, etc.

A4.3 Counts of community supervision of youths

Number of youths on probation has remained stable from 1992/03 to 2002/03²⁹

In 2002/03, the average month-end count of youths on supervised probation was approximately 26,400, virtually unchanged from the previous year (-1%). The overall average month-end count of young offenders on supervised probation in 2002/03 was relatively consistent with the number recorded ten years earlier.³⁰


Property offenders account for the largest proportion of youths admitted to probation

Among the reporting jurisdictions,³¹ 26,200 youths commenced probation in 2002/03. In comparison to the previous year, intakes to supervised probation decreased 7%. Prince Edward Island (+3%) and Saskatchewan (+5%) experienced increases while the remaining eight reporting jurisdictions all reported declines ranging from 4% to 28%.

In the five jurisdictions³² that classify admissions according to the most serious offence, property offences were the most common, representing just under half (47%) of all probation admissions. The second most common type of youth probationer was violent offenders (30%). Increasingly, however, probation officers are dealing with youths convicted of other crimes, such as drug offences and *YOA* offences. In 2002/03, 23% of all probation cases involved offenders convicted of other offences, compared to 17% in 1997/98, the year trend data became available. During this same six-year period, property offences dropped eight percentage points, while violent offences increased slightly (two percentage points) (Figure A4.5).

Figure A4.5

Violent offences account for greater proportion of youth probation admissions, 1997/98 to 2002/03¹



1. Probation admissions data by most serious offence includes Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, Ontario youths aged 16 to 17, Alberta, and British Columbia. YCCS units of count for Alberta and Newfoundland and Labrador have been tabulated from micro-data based on standardized definitions that may differ from those being applied locally. In Alberta, there are substantial methodological differences such that these statistics cannot be reproduced by Alberta Correctional Services. Accordingly, caution should be used when comparing statistics for these jurisdictions against similar statistics that have been generated by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

Source: Youth Corrections and Community Services Survey, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

A4.4 Counts of community supervision of adults

Number of adults serving a conditional sentence is increasing

In 2002/03, the count of adults on community supervision was about 124,000, of which probation³³ accounted for 83%, conditional sentences for 10%, and conditional releases for 7%.³⁴ With respect to probation, the overall count (103,000) continued a ten-year period of relative stability in 2002/03, with a slight increase (1%) from the previous year. Conversely, the number of adults serving a conditional sentence has been steadily climbing since its adoption in 1996. About 13,000 adults were on a conditional sentence in 2002/03, an increase of 8% from 2001/02 and nearly 88% from 1997/98.

Admission statistics provide a slightly different view of the pattern of probation over time. While the number of adults starting probation changed very little in 2002/03, admissions have increased 8% since 1999/00 and are at the highest point since data collection began in 1980/81.³⁵ While the large proportion of admissions in Ontario and the steady increase in admissions in that province account for much of this increase, trends in corrections coincide with overall trends in sentencing. For instance, the number of adult court cases ending in probation as the most serious sentence has increased from 146,809 in 1994/95 to 188,399 in 2003/04, a jump of 28%. This increase has been steady since 1999/00, with some fluctuations in prior years. At a provincial/territorial level, the majority of the reporting provinces experienced either stability or decreases in the number of probationers compared to the previous year. One-year increases were reported by British Columbia (+7%), Nova Scotia (+5%), and Ontario (+4%).

In terms of conditional sentences, admission data mirror the upward trend observed in the actual number of persons on conditional sentence.

Violent offenders are the most common clientele of probation officers

The largest proportion of adult offenders admitted to probation in 2002/03 was convicted of a violent offence (47%). The next largest group of probationers were convicted of property crimes (25%), followed by other *Criminal Code* offences (22%), other federal/provincial/ territorial statute offences and municipal by-law infractions (4%).

Use of parole is decreasing for both federal and provincial offenders

The release of offenders from custody into the community is governed differently for offenders under the federal correctional system compared with those under provincial/ territorial jurisdiction. In the federal correctional system, there are three types of conditional release: day parole, full parole and statutory release.³⁶ The National Parole Board grants day parole and full parole for federal offenders. In the provincial system, provincial parole boards operate only in Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia. In other jurisdictions, provincially or territorially sentenced offenders apply to the National Parole Board for day and full parole. Statutory release does not apply to offenders serving less than two years in the provincial/territorial system. Under statutory release, federal offenders are generally released on remission after two-thirds of their sentence has been served.


Despite some increases in the late 1990s, the average monthly count of adults on parole has generally been decreasing since the early 90s. In 2002/03, there was a monthly average of 3,966 offenders on full parole under the supervision of the National Parole Board. This represents a 7% decrease from the monthly average for the previous year and a 36% decrease from the peak count of 6,176 in 1993/94 (Figure A4.6). With respect to day parolees, the average monthly count under National Parole Board supervision in 2002/03 was 7% fewer than the previous year (1,115 versus 1,193) and 35% lower than the in 1993/94 (Figure A4.6).

The average monthly count of offenders on parole under the supervision of the provincial parole boards in Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia has also been dropping. In 2002/03, provincial parole boards reported supervising an average of 1,014 offenders every month, compared to 1,387 (-27%) in the previous year (Figure A4.6). As a result of years of steady declines, in 2002/03, provincial parole boards were supervising, on average each month, just over one-quarter the number of parolees supervised during the peak in 1993/94.

The changes in the number of individuals on full and day parole can reflect changes in the number of applications for parole and the parole grant rate. In 2002/03, the National Parole Board reviewed 3,527 applications for full parole from federal inmates and 439 applications from provincial/territorial inmates (Table A4.3). In both cases, applications for full parole have been on a downward trend in recent years. The number of federal offenders who applied for full parole decreased for the third year in a row in 2002/03 (-9%), while the number of provincial/territorial applicants fell 14%, continuing a steady drop since 1992/93. These decreases in full parole applications are associated with the decline in the average number of adults incarcerated.

The average number of offenders on statutory release in a given month has remained relatively stable, despite a slight peak in 1994/95 (Figure A4.6). The monthly average of 2,141 offenders on statutory release in 2002/03 remained virtually unchanged from the monthly average of 2,152 recorded the previous year.

Figure A4.6
Average monthly counts of adults released on parole have been dropping



Note: In addition to offenders in the federal correctional system, National Parole Board Statistics include offenders in provincial correctional systems in provinces that do not have their own provincial parole boards. Provincial parole boards exist in Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Corrections Survey.

Despite decreases in parole applications, the National Parole Board (2003) indicated in their 2002/03 performance report that the workload continues to be heavy. The National Parole Board attributes this to an increasingly violent offence profile of federal offenders, heavy demands for conditional release reviews and pardons, new initiatives to involve victims in the parole process, and the introduction of management improvement initiatives.

In terms of parole grant rates, trends can be measured by examining changes in the percentage of inmates who applied for parole and were granted release. For federal offenders, the grant rate for full parole has remained relatively stable at around 43% since 1998/99 (Table A4.3). Given this stability, the grant rate for federal inmates does not appear to have an impact on the changing number of persons on full parole.

However, when looking at grant rates for provincial/territorial inmates, the National Parole Board's granting practices have influenced the drop in the number of persons on full parole, as the grant rate fell from a peak of 69% in 1991/92 to 57% in 2002/03.

Similarly, the number of reviews conducted by the provincial parole boards in Quebec and Ontario³⁷ has decreased for the tenth consecutive year to 3,926 from 11,099 in 1992/93. This combined with the drop in grant rates (from 56% to 41%) for the provincial parole boards further explains the decreasing number of persons on full parole.

In terms of day parole, the main contributor to the drop in day parolees relates to the 20% decrease in the number of applications since 1999/00. Trends in grant rate for day parole have remained unchanged in 2002/03 (71%), but has decreased slightly since peaking at 74% in 1998/99.

Number of pardon applications on the decline

In addition to managing the current offender population, another aspect of correctional workload is the processing of applications for pardons.³⁸ The workload is particularly heavy when there is a backlog of applications due to the volume of applications exceeding the processing capacity (National Parole Board, 2003). According to the National Parole Board, the number of pardon applications received annually has been decreasing since 1999/00. This includes a 6% drop in 2002/03 from 18,016 applications to 16,989.

Some factors that can trigger either an increase or decrease in applications include: the pardon service fee (which was implemented in 1995/96); an increase in public awareness of the pardon program through, for instance, a media story or a speech; perceived need for or utility of a pardon by an individual for the purpose of employment, travel, etc., and the level of effort required from applicants (since April 1997, applicants need to obtain certain documentation from police and courts, to which a fee is normally associated) (National Parole Board, 2003).

A5. Workload of victim services

Increasingly, the criminal justice system is taking on the responsibility of providing services to victims of crime by either delivering services directly or by funding community-based agencies. While traditional non-justice sector agencies still exist, such as transition homes for abused women and sexual assault support centres, the evolution of victims' rights over the last few decades has translated into the provision of services at the police, court and corrections levels. In some jurisdictions, ministries responsible for criminal justice matters have taken a holistic approach to victim services by directly providing "one-stop" services that assist the victim throughout their experience with the criminal justice system.

The workload of victim services can be measured by the number of persons assisted. Further, as with police, courts and corrections, the seriousness of cases being handled by victim services and shelters can also be a workload indicator as more serious cases require more resources.

A5.1 Number of persons assisted

According to the Victim Service Survey, 412 victim service agencies (other than shelters for abused women) reported assisting approximately 360,000 people affected by crime during 2002/03. This count is an under-estimate given that 15% of the 493 agencies that responded to the survey could not provide annual counts (Kong, 2004).

Few agencies are able to provide annual counts of clients by client characteristics, such as age, sex and type of victimization. However, a one-day survey snapshot taken on October 22, 2003 showed that more than three-quarters (78%) of the roughly 4,400 people who sought assistance that day were victims (either directly or indirectly) of a violent crime and that the majority (77%) of all people helped were women or girls.

Nationally, 41% of people assisted on snapshot day were victims³⁹ of non-sexual violent crime, 30% were victims of sexual assault, 5% were people affected by a homicide or other offences resulting in the loss of life, and 3% were victims of criminal harassment. The remaining 22% had experienced other types of incidents including property and traffic offences.

According to the Transition Home Survey, in 2003/04, 95,326 women and dependent children were admitted to the 473 shelters across Canada that responded to the survey that year (Figure A5.1) (Taylor-Butts, 2005). In a snapshot taken as of noon April 14, 2004, 2,496 women (76%) and 2,501 children (88%) living in shelters were there to escape abuse (Figure A5.2).


Because the number of shelters in Canada changes over time, analysis of trends in shelter use can only be done by holding the number of shelters constant. Overall, there were 332 shelters that responded to the last three cycles of the survey. According to the 332 that consistently reported admissions information, the number of admissions since 1998 has decreased 11% (Taylor-Butts, 2005). This decline is largely due to the 26% decrease in the number of children residing in shelters (Table A5.1). It should

be noted that the decrease in the number of children accompanying their mothers to shelters coincided with changes to some provincial child welfare policies that allow child welfare authorities to place children into the care of the state in cases of spousal abuse. Overall, trend data show that the number of women and children residing in shelters each year on snapshot day because of abuse have not fluctuated greatly since 1998, averaging at 1,777 children per year and 1,706 women.

Findings from the survey also suggest that the number of women residing in shelters for reasons other than abuse has increased somewhat. This may be due to the changing nature of shelters, with some transition homes having converted to emergency shelters that also serve people needing refuge for reasons other than abuse. Despite increasing in number, women in shelters for reasons other than abuse continue to account for less than one-fifth of residents.

Figure A5.1

Number of admissions of women and dependant children to shelters, 1992/93 to 2003/04¹




1. An admission is the official acceptance of a resident into the facility with the allocation of a bed. A woman admitted more than once during the year will be counted as more than one admission.
2. This biennial survey was not conducted in 1997 due to survey redevelopment.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Transition Home Survey.

Figure A5.2

Number of women residing in shelters because of abuse, snapshot day, 1992 to 2004



1. This biennial survey was not conducted in 1997 due to survey redevelopment.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Transition Home Survey.

Appendix A

Tables for Workload

Table A1.1

Number of violent, property and other *Criminal Code* offences, Canada, 1977 to 2004

	Total violent crime	Total property crime	Total 'Other <i>Criminal Code</i> ' ¹	Total <i>Criminal Code</i> offences
	Number			
1977	135,749	1,059,688	458,587	1,654,024
1978	138,975	1,097,242	478,083	1,714,300
1979	147,528	1,186,697	521,046	1,855,271
1980	155,863	1,334,619	554,916	2,045,398
1981	162,229	1,429,520	576,453	2,168,202
1982	168,643	1,466,923	568,099	2,203,665
1983	172,315	1,422,703	553,615	2,148,633
1984	179,396	1,408,663	559,597	2,147,656
1985	189,822	1,408,717	575,636	2,174,175
1986	204,917	1,448,550	624,282	2,277,749
1987	219,383	1,468,591	680,984	2,368,958
1988	232,607	1,457,361	700,040	2,390,008
1989	248,579	1,443,048	734,309	2,425,936
1990	269,507	1,554,348	803,342	2,627,197
1991	296,963	1,726,769	875,257	2,898,989
1992	307,512	1,674,773	865,696	2,847,981
1993	310,198	1,599,037	826,388	2,735,623
1994	303,745	1,524,519	817,945	2,646,209
1995	295,702	1,550,725	793,227	2,639,654
1996	296,746	1,561,811	786,336	2,644,893
1997	296,890	1,459,536	778,340	2,534,766
1998	296,166	1,377,901	787,089	2,461,156
1999	291,327	1,299,981	765,523	2,356,831
2000	302,098	1,252,387	798,283	2,352,768
2001	305,186	1,241,936	827,689	2,374,811
2002	303,946	1,246,481	867,017	2,417,444
2003	305,667	1,305,229	968,276	2,579,172
2004	302,257	1,274,931	994,672	2,571,860

1. 'Other *Criminal Code*' offences include: mischief, counterfeit currency, disturbing the peace, bail violations, offensive weapons, arson, obstructing a public or peace officers, indecent acts, prostitution and trespassing at night.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Table A2.1**Youth participation in alternative measures, by jurisdiction, 1998/99 to 2002/03**

Jurisdiction	1997/98	1998/99	1999/00	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	Percentage change 2001/02 to 2002/03	Percentage change 1997/98 to 2002/03
	Number							
Newfoundland and Labrador	780	502	577	537	496	424	-15	-46
Prince Edward Island	180	187	127	106	170	133	-22	-26
Nova Scotia	1,182	1,010
New Brunswick	718	726	587	618	5	-14
Quebec	9,683	9,279	9,162	9,126	9,287	10,427	12	8
Ontario (16 to 17-year-olds)	2,511	2,070	2,114	1,936	2,019	2,117	5	-16
Manitoba	1,934	1,509	1,866	1,509	1,658	1,182	-29	-39
Saskatchewan ¹	1,731	1,796	1,415	2,312	2,380	2,637	11	52
Alberta ²	9,111	10,014	5,966	6,706	12	-26
British Columbia	..	2,003
Yukon	47	42	44	50	68	91	34	94
Northwest Territories ³	212	105	118	170	44	...
Nunavut
Total⁴	28,089	29,243	15,305	15,576	22,749	24,505	8	-19
Adjusted totals for 1997/98 and 2002/03⁵	26,907	24,505	...	-9

.. figures not available for a specific reference period

... figures not applicable

1. Caution should be exercised when making comparisons between 2000/01 and previous years because of changes in data collection procedures in Saskatchewan.
2. Alberta was unable to report complete data in 1999/00 and 2000/01.
3. Northwest Territories data prior to 1999/00 may not be compared with data from 2000/01 onward due to the creation of Nunavut on April 1, 1999.
4. The total excludes British Columbia for 1997/98; Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Alberta, British Columbia, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut for 1999/00 and 2000/01; and, Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Nunavut for 2001/02 and 2002/03.
5. The total for 1997/98 excludes Nova Scotia in order to render counts for 1997/98 and 2002/03 comparable.

Note: Due to rounding, figures may not add to totals.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Alternative Measures Survey.

Table A3.1**Number of adult criminal court cases by decision and trial/non-trial, 1994/95 to 2002/03¹**

	Total			Guilty			Acquitted		
	Total	Trial	Non-trial	Total	Trial	Non-trial	Total	Trial	Non-trial
1994/95	437,948	40,923	397,025	268,260	31,919	236,341	9,004	9,004	...
1995/96	423,305	47,208	376,097	266,029	35,734	230,295	11,474	11,474	...
1996/97	407,820	44,771	363,049	259,762	33,232	226,530	11,539	11,539	...
1997/98	397,944	40,842	357,102	245,920	29,454	216,466	11,388	11,388	...
1998/99	384,437	38,333	346,104	237,139	27,419	209,720	10,914	10,914	...
1999/00	369,811	35,219	334,592	226,012	24,603	201,409	10,616	10,616	...
2000/01	367,883	34,689	333,194	225,596	24,270	201,326	10,419	10,419	...
2001/02	382,072	35,028	347,044	230,921	23,423	207,498	11,605	11,605	...
2002/03 ^r	397,213	35,918	361,295	237,211	24,231	212,980	11,687	11,687	...
2003/04	380,978	35,857	345,121	219,856	23,642	196,214	12,215	12,215	...

	Stay/Withdrawn ²			Other ³		
	Total	Trial	Non-trial	Total	Trial	Non-trial
1994/95	129,776	...	129,776	30,908	...	30,908
1995/96	125,287	...	125,287	20,515	...	20,515
1996/97	121,289	...	121,289	15,230	...	15,230
1997/98	125,747	...	125,747	14,889	...	14,889
1998/99	123,518	...	123,518	12,866	...	12,866
1999/00	120,718	...	120,718	12,465	...	12,465
2000/01	120,195	...	120,195	11,673	...	11,673
2001/02	128,923	...	128,923	10,623	...	10,623
2002/03 ^r	137,215	...	137,215	11,100	...	11,100
2003/04	136,956	...	136,956	11,951	...	11,951

... not applicable

^r revised

1. Due to missing data for some years, data on New Brunswick and the Northwest Territories have been excluded. Data on Manitoba and Nunavut are not currently available.
2. Stay/withdrawn includes cases stayed, withdrawn, dismissed and discharges at preliminary inquiry.
3. Other decisions include final decisions of found not criminally responsible, waived in province/territory, and waived out of province/territory. This category also includes decisions where a conviction was not recorded, the court accepted a special plea, cases which raised *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* arguments, or cases where the accused was found unfit to stand trial.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.

Table A4.1**Proportion of average daily counts of youth in custody, 1993/94, 2001/02 and 2002/03¹**

	1993/94 ¹		2001/02 ¹		2002/03 ¹		Percentage change from 1993/94 to 2002/03	Percentage change from 2001/02 to 2002/03
	Average daily count	Percentage of total correctional count	Average daily count	Percentage of total correctional count	Average daily count	Percentage of total correctional count		
Remand	703	18	907	28	849	28	21	-6
Sentenced custody	3,256	82	2,294	72	2,131	72	-35	-7
Secure custody	1,625	41	1,156	36	1,067	36	-34	-8
Open custody	1,631	41	1,138	36	1,064	36	-35	-7
Total custody	3,959	100	3,201	100	2,980	100	-25	-7

1. Due to the unavailability of data, Ontario 12 to 15 year olds, have been excluded.

Note: Due to rounding, percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Corrections Key Indicator Report.

Table A4.2**Total adult admissions to federal and provincial/territorial custody¹**

	Federal admissions	Provincial and territorial admissions	Total admissions
1978/79	4,862	141,958	146,820
1979/80	4,653	141,476	146,129
1980/81	4,793	153,628	158,421
1981/82	5,401	164,124	169,525
1982/83	5,815	180,781	186,596
1983/84	5,880	170,823	176,703
1984/85	5,835	165,163	170,998
1985/86	6,120	161,691	167,811
1986/87	5,615	160,884	166,499
1987/88	6,256	166,870	173,126
1988/89	6,256	177,523	183,779
1989/90	6,586	182,173	188,759
1990/91	6,454	188,845	195,299
1991/92	7,275	226,840	234,115
1992/93	7,733	229,667	237,400
1993/94	9,934	224,350	234,284
1994/95	9,079	223,032	232,111
1995/96	7,850	216,163	224,013
1996/97	7,422	215,754	223,176
1997/98	7,342	202,949	210,291
1998/99	7,855	195,800	203,655
1999/00	7,906	199,971	207,877
2000/01	7,889	207,750	215,639
2001/02 ^r	7,458	219,388	226,846
2002/03	7,659	226,374	234,033

^r revised

1. Due to missing data for some years, New Brunswick, Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut have been excluded.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Correctional Services Survey.

Table A4.3**Number of full parole release reviews by the National Parole Board and the provincial parole boards**

	National Parole Board Reviews						Provincial parole boards review ¹		
	Federal offenders			Provincial and territorial offenders			Provincial and territorial offenders		
	Application	Granted	Grant rate	Application	Granted	Grant rate	Application	Granted	Grant rate
1991/92	6,958	2,381	34	952	661	69	10,320	5,000	48
1992/93	7,243	2,693	37	1,071	695	65	11,099	6,210	56
1993/94	6,915	2,638	38	1,066	677	64	11,072	7,059	64
1994/95	6,655	2,223	33	1,089	563	52	10,981	6,254	57
1995/96	5,669	1,954	34	900	448	50	9,370	5,114	55
1996/97	4,356	1,745	40	886	462	52	8,863	4,421	50
1997/98	4,691	1,979	42	751	327	44	7,771	3,992	51
1998/99	4,850	2,116	44	706	441	62	7,289	3,813	52
1999/00	4,991	2,168	43	688	419	61	6,076	3,035	50
2000/01	4,278	1,814	42	571	342	60	5,240	2,315	44
2001/02	3,841	1,659	43	462	260	56	4,559	1,834	40
2002/03	3,527	1,502	43	439	251	57	3,926	1,628	41

1. Includes data from Ontario and Quebec provincial parole boards. Trend data are not available for the British Columbia parole board.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Correctional Services Survey.

Table A5.1
Annual admissions¹ to shelters by facility, 1998 to 2004²

		Total				
Canada	1998	2000	2002	2004	Percentage change 1998 to 2002	
Total	69,010	62,485	66,023	61,173	-13	
Transition home ³	52,001	42,775	42,911	38,065	-37	
Second stage housing ⁴	1,750	1,748	1,769	2,008	13	
Safe home network ⁵	341	335	499	267	-28	
Women's emergency centre ⁶	7,445	8,672	11,033	8,223	9	
Emergency shelter ⁷	4,852	6,086	6,122	9,691	50	
Family resource centre ⁸	1,968	1,899	1,438	1,498	-31	
Other ⁹	653	970	2,251	1,421	54	

		Women				
Canada	1998	2000	2002	2004	Percentage change 1998 to 2002	
Total	35,499	33,647	35,759	34,611	-3	
Transition home ³	26,773	23,027	22,995	21,292	-26	
Second stage housing ⁴	720	739	783	824	13	
Safe home network ⁵	175	164	257	139	-26	
Women's emergency centre ⁶	3,618	4,270	5,750	4,824	25	
Emergency shelter ⁷	2,793	3,912	3,785	5,681	51	
Family resource centre ⁸	1,068	999	804	861	-24	
Other ⁹	352	536	1,385	990	64	

		Children				
Canada	1998	2000	2002	2004	Percentage change 1998 to 2002	
Total	33,511	28,838	30,264	26,562	-26	
Transition home ³	25,228	19,748	19,916	16,773	-50	
Second stage housing ⁴	1,030	1,009	986	1,184	13	
Safe home network ⁵	166	171	242	128	-30	
Women's emergency centre ⁶	3,827	4,402	5,283	3,399	-13	
Emergency shelter ⁷	2,059	2,174	2,337	4,010	49	
Family resource centre ⁸	900	900	634	637	-41	
Other ⁹	301	434	866	431	30	

1. A person may be admitted more than once during the reporting period.
2. Figures relate only to the 332 shelters that responded to this question in both the 1998, 2000, 2002 and 2004 cycles of the survey.
3. Short or moderate term (1 day to 11 weeks), also referred to as first stage emergency housing.
4. Long-term (3-12 months), secure housing with support and referral services designed to assist women while they search for permanent housing.
5. A network of private homes in rural or remote areas where there is no full-fledged operating shelter. It offers subsidiary very short-term (1-3 days), emergency housing.
6. Short-term (1-21 days), respite (temporary relief) for women and their dependent children.
7. Short-term (1-3 days), respite for a wide population range, not exclusively abused women. Some facilities may provide accommodation for men as well as women. This type of facility may accommodate residents who are not associated with family abuse but are without a home due to an emergency situation (e.g., eviction for non-payment of rent). Other than residential (room and board) services, these shelters offer few additional client services.
8. An Ontario government initiative that serves a wide range of clients and provides clients with an extensive array of information and referrals as well as residential services.
9. All other facilities/shelters not otherwise classified. This category may include Rural Family Violence Prevention Centres in Alberta, Interim Housing in Manitoba, and other types of emergency shelters, such as YWCAs. These services may not be exclusive to abused women.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Transition Home Survey.

B. Prime Performance Indicators

Performance indicators provide information useful in assessing how the components of the criminal justice system and the system overall are performing. They are commonly understood as either process-oriented, or as oriented toward outcomes of the various components of the system. Performance indicators can prove useful for criminal justice policy-makers and planners for a number of reasons. For example, there are some indicators that can provide a means of determining whether or not the justice system is meeting its goals and objectives or achieving its intended results. Other indicators can provide a public accounting of the criminal justice system and can assist in the planning process by providing benchmarks for assessing short-, medium-, and long-term goals (e.g. to improve efficiencies or reduce the amount of time it takes to bring a case to trial). Moreover, performance indicators can assist in the development of policy by helping identify what is working within the systems and where improvements could be made.

While performance indicators can serve a valuable function, some also have inherent disadvantages. For example, data may be unavailable for such broad-based indicators as those that measure activity across all components of the criminal justice system, from the time an offence is committed to when a sentence is completed. Others that are often considered important measures of performance may be ambiguous. An example of this is the rate of crime reported to the police. While increasing crime rates can be interpreted as a failure of the justice system to prevent crime and protect society, these changes may also reflect an increased willingness on the part of victims to report crimes, improvements in the accessibility of reporting, improvements in the capacity of police to detect crimes and enforce the law, or changes to legislation which criminalize behaviours not previously classified as crimes. Other important indicators may not be available at all, or may be available only for a period of time or for certain geographic areas. The available performance measures therefore may not capture the totality of the work the criminal justice system performs.

Efforts to document performance are most advantageous when presented within generally accepted goals and objectives of the criminal justice system. As indicated earlier in the introduction of this report, the criminal justice community identified the broad objectives of the criminal justice system as the achievement of the following five goals:

1. Public order, safety and national security through prevention and intervention
2. Offender accountability, reintegration and rehabilitation
3. Public trust, confidence and respect for the criminal justice system
4. Social equity and access to the criminal justice system for all citizens
5. Victim needs served

This section will present a number of indicators that can help assess the performance of the criminal justice system with respect to each of these goals.

B1. Goal 1: Public order, safety and national security through prevention and intervention

It is the responsibility of the criminal justice system to actively promote the safety and well-being of individuals and communities so that citizens can live with reduced risk of crime and victimization. Indicators that can help assess the ability of the justice system to achieve this goal include how much Canada invests in crime prevention, crime reduction and the administration of the criminal justice system; the extent of criminal activity and victimization and how it changes over time; how Canada's victimization rate compares to other industrialized countries; the use of firearms in the commission of crime; and, the prevalence of organized crime.

B1.1 Overall cost of administering the sectors of the criminal justice system

Public confidence in the justice system is influenced by the way in which it is administered. A justice system that is seen to be effective and efficient will exude confidence from the public. Governments, however, must meet the challenge of balancing the state of the economy with public expectations and needs.

Policing accounts for the largest portion of the justice dollar

In 2002/03 federal, provincial, territorial and municipal governments combined spent \$37 billion on public safety, including the 'protection of persons and property'⁴⁰, or 8% of total spending at all levels of government. Between 1972/73 and 1998/99⁴¹, expenditures on justice consistently accounted for about 40% of all protection of persons and property spending and 3% of total government expenditures.

In 2002/03, over \$12 billion were spent on administering policing, courts, legal aid, prosecutions and adult corrections in Canada, amounting to \$399 per Canadian. Among the five sectors, policing activities represented the largest expenditure at 61%, followed by adult corrections (22%), courts (9%), legal aid (5%) and criminal prosecutions (3%). The distribution of justice spending among the sectors has remained relatively unchanged over the past number of years.


Justice spending has increased steadily

While the distribution of spending has remained fairly stable, the total per capita spending on justice services has increased consistently over the last seven years (Figure B1.1). Adjusting for inflation, per capita spending on justice increased 8% between 1996/97 and 2002/03.

Justice spending varies across the country

A number of factors can influence variations in justice spending across the provinces and territories. Differences in population characteristics, crime rates, caseloads, and how jurisdictions are organized to administer justice are examples of such factors.

Figure B1.1
Per capita spending on justice services on the rise since 1997/98¹



1. Figures for 1991/92, 1993/94, 1995/96, 1997/98, 1999/00 and 2001/02 for Courts and Prosecutions are estimates. In order to create constant dollar figures with the effects of inflation removed, figures were converted to a base of 1992=100 using Statistics Canada's Consumer Price Index (CPI). Information the consumer price index for Canada, the provinces and territories can be obtained at http://www40.statcan.ca/101/ind01/12_3956.htm.

Sources: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Police Administration Survey; Courts Resources, Expenditures and Personnel Survey; Legal Aid Survey; Criminal Prosecutions Personnel and Expenditure Survey; and Adult Correctional Services Survey; and, Statistics Canada, Consumer Price Index.

Among the provinces justice per capita spending was lowest in New Brunswick (\$211), Newfoundland and Labrador (\$218) and Prince Edward Island (\$218) and highest in Ontario (\$324), Saskatchewan (\$315) and Manitoba (\$308) in 2002/03. Concerning the North, the Northwest Territories has the highest per capita spending at \$1,153. Between 1996/97 and 2002/03, all provinces and territories reported an increase in per capita spending except in the case of New Brunswick where there was no change in expenditures.⁴² Among those provinces reporting an increase, Saskatchewan (+17%), Newfoundland and Labrador (+15%) and Manitoba (+14%) reported the largest increases, while Nova Scotia (+2)⁴³, Prince Edward Island (+5%), Quebec (+5%) and Ontario (+5%) showed the smallest.

B1.2 Number and rate of criminal incidents reported to crime victim surveys⁴⁴

An important indicator of the overall safety and security of the Canadian population is the extent to which Canadians are criminally victimized. While police statistics provide an important measure of the number of criminal incidents that are reported to the authorities, the 2004 General Social Survey on Victimization shows that, among the eight crime types measured by the survey, 64% of incidents that occurred 12 months prior to the survey were never brought to the attention of police. The survey also shows that people chose not to report their criminal victimization to the police for a number of different reasons. Cited most often as the main reason for not reporting to police was that victims did not feel that the incident was important enough (38%). A further 18% of victims who did not bring the incident to the attention of the authorities avoided doing so because they felt that the police couldn't do anything and 16% said the incident was dealt with another way.

Beginning in 1988, through the General Social Survey program, Statistics Canada began to measure criminal victimization. The General Social Survey on Victimization is a random household survey that asks people 15 years of age and older living in the 10 provinces⁴⁵ about their perceptions of crime and the justice system and whether, in the past 12 months, they had been the victim of either a personal or household crime. This survey has been repeated in 1993, 1999 and most recently in 2004. Two important enhancements were made to the 1999 and 2004 survey cycles: the inclusion of a module to measure spousal violence and an improved definition of assault. To compare 1993 data with data from 1999 and 2004 would require the exclusion of spousal violence and adjustments to the assault data for that year. As such, analysis of trends in personal victimization in this report will examine changes from 1999 to 2004. Trends in household victimization will examine data from 1993, 1999 and 2004 since no changes affected the comparability of these types of crimes. No comparisons will be made to crime data captured in the 1988 cycle as significant changes were made to crime categories between 1988 and 1993.


Increase in rates of criminal victimization driven by increases in non-violent incidents

In 2004, 28% of the Canadian population 15 years of age and older living in the ten provinces were victims of at least one crime in the previous year. This figure represents a slight increase from the 1999 figure of 26% and seems to be driven by a slight increase in incidents of theft of personal property and household crimes (Gannon & Mihorean, 2005). In 2004 (and similar to 1999), 34% were incidents against household property, including break and enter, motor vehicle/parts theft, theft of household property and vandalism. Twenty-nine percent of incidents reported to the survey in 2004 involved physical assault, sexual assault or robbery and a further 25% involved theft of personal property. The remaining 12% of incidents could not be classified as either personal or household crimes (e.g. incidents of fraud, hit and run, etc.).

The rate of violent victimization remained stable from 1999 to 2004. According to the 2004 GSS, there were 106 incidents of violent victimization for every 1,000 Canadians aged 15 years and older, a number which is not statistically different from the rate of 111 recorded in 1999 (Figure B1.2). On the other hand, from 1999 to 2004, the rate of personal theft jumped from 75 to 93 incidents per 1,000 population, marking a 24% increase. The rate for personal property theft has almost doubled since 1993 when it was recorded at 52 incidents per 1,000 population.

Similar to theft of personal property, the rate for household criminal victimization continued to increase. The rate of 248 incidents per 1,000 households recorded in 2004 is 14% higher than the rate recorded in 1999 (218) and represents a 28% increase over 1993's rate (193) (Figure B1.3). The increase in 2004 was fuelled by growth in theft of household property (+42%) and vandalism (+16%). In contrast, the rate for break and enters decreased.

Figure B1.2
Rates of violent victimization remain unchanged¹




1. The differences between 1999 and 2004 figures are not statistically significant.

Note: Includes incidents of spousal sexual and physical assault.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 1999 and 2004.

Figure B1.3
Rates of household property theft and vandalism continue to increase



1. The difference between 1999 and 2004 figures is not statistically significant.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 1993, 1999, 2004.

Rates of household victimization highest in western Canada

Victimization rates vary from province to province. According to the 2004 GSS, the highest rates of violent victimization were recorded in Alberta (160 incidents per 1,000 population) and in Nova Scotia (157) (Table B1.1). Rates for the remaining provinces ranged from 139 per 1,000 in Manitoba to a low of 59 in Quebec.⁴⁶

In the case of household crimes, risk of victimization was highest in the western provinces of Canada⁴⁷, a pattern which is similar to the findings from the 1999 GSS. Saskatchewan and Manitoba's rates were highest among the provinces (406 and 403 incidents per 1,000 households) and represented the largest increases over 1999 (Table B1.1). Rates for Newfoundland and Labrador (127) and Quebec (147) were lowest and were significantly below the national rate of 248.

B1.3 Overall victimization rate compared to other industrialized countries


A measure of Canada's success in the prevention of crime and the safety of Canadians is examining how Canada's rate of criminal victimization compares to levels of crime in other countries. Since 1989, Canada has participated in the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS). The most recent survey for which results are available was conducted in 2000 and Canada was among one of the 17 industrialized countries that participated.⁴⁸

Similar to Canada's GSS on Victimization, the ICVS is a random household survey that asks people aged 16 years of age or older about their experiences of criminal victimization in the 12 months preceding the survey period. While the GSS includes measures of eight personal and household crimes, the ICVS collects information on eleven different offences.⁴⁹

Canada among the top one-third reporting incidents of criminal victimization

Among 13 of the industrialized countries that participated in the 2000 ICVS,⁵⁰ approximately 22% of those aged 16 years or older indicated that they had experienced at least one of the eleven offences measured by the survey. Among the countries, rates ranged from a low of 15% in Northern Ireland, Japan and Portugal to a high of 30% in Australia (Figure B1.4). Canada's rate fell in the top one third at 24%. In 2000, only Australia, England and Wales, the Netherlands and Sweden out-ranked Canada's overall rate of criminal victimization.

Between 1996 and 2000, rates among the 13 industrialized countries remained relatively stable. Canada, along with five other countries that participated in both cycles of the ICVS, saw no significant change in their rate of criminal victimization. The four remaining countries (England and Wales, France, the Netherlands and Scotland) showed a decrease in rates.

Figure B1.4**Among international rates of victimization, Canada is in the top third¹**

1. Based on persons who were victims of at least one of 11 crime types in the previous year.

Source: Statistics Canada, 2000 International Crime Victimization Survey.

Canadians among the least likely to report an incident to the police

Overall, the 2000 ICVS found that on average approximately one in two (55%) of those who experienced a criminal victimization reported to the police. Among the 13 countries, Canada ranked in the bottom three where only 49% of victims indicated that they reported the incident to the police. Scotland (65%), Netherlands (64%) and England and Wales (62%) were among the top three countries, while Japan (39%) and Poland (45%) residents were the least likely to contact the police.

Similar to the GSS, the ICVS indicates that there has been a downward trend in reporting to the police for Canada. While the GSS reported a drop of 5 percentage points in police reporting between 1993 and 1999⁵¹, the ICVS witnessed a 6 percentage point drop between 1996 and 2000. France was the only other country among the 13 countries that showed a significant decrease, while Finland, Netherlands and Scotland experienced increases in police reporting. The remaining countries did not see significant changes in rates of police reporting.

B1.4 Use of firearms in the commission of homicide and robbery


Over the past few decades, Canada has introduced legislation to address the issue of firearms in the commission of crime, including Bills C-51, C-17 and C-68. Based on the premise that the removal of illegal firearms and greater controls over the use of legal firearms will increase public safety and ultimately reduce crime, each of these pieces of legislation introduced different measures to this aim, such as the need to obtain a Firearms Acquisition Certificate, stricter screening procedures for gun ownership and firearm registration.

Firearms killings continue to account for about one-third of all homicides

Since 1979, the most common methods used in the commission of a homicide have fluctuated between shootings and stabbings. Overall, since 1979, firearms have been used in approximately one-third of all homicides each year (Figure B1.5). This trend continued in 2004 with 28% of all homicides committed with a firearm. However, from 1974 to 2004, the type of firearm used has been changing with the use of rifles or shotguns decreasing and the use of handguns increasing.

Figure B1.5

Since 1979, firearms homicides have accounted for about one-third of homicides each year




Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Homicide Survey.

Rate of firearm homicides has decreased more than the rate of non-firearm homicides

In 2004, 172 victims were shot to death. This number represents an increase of 11 victims from 2003 and is similar to the 10-year average of 174 victims. Trends in the rate of firearm and non-firearm homicides have been following the general downward trend of homicides overall. The rate of firearm homicides, however, began decreasing earlier than the rate for non-firearm homicides (1975 compared to 1986) and has seen larger declines (Figure B1.6).

Figure B1.6
Rate of homicide with a firearm has decreased more than the rate without¹




1. Population estimates come from the *Annual Demographic Statistics, 2004* report, produced by Statistics Canada, Demography Division. Populations as of July 1st: preliminary postcensal estimates for 2004.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Homicide Survey.

The rate of robberies committed using a firearm also declining


The proportion of robberies committed using a firearm has decreased dramatically since the late 1970s (Figure B1.7). In 1977, firearms accounted for 39% of robberies, compared to just 14% in 2004. With the exception of 2003 when the rate of firearm robberies increased 10%, the rate has been declining steadily since 1991 including a 3% decline in 2004 (Figure B1.8). During this same time period, the rate of robberies with other weapons has remained relatively stable and the rate of robberies with no weapons has fluctuated. Incident-based police data, which provide detail on the types of weapons used, suggest that the use of knives has replaced firearms.

Figure B1.7
Proportion of robberies with firearms has decreased dramatically



Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Figure B1.8
Rate of robberies with a firearm decreased from 1991 to 2002¹



1. Population estimates come from the *Annual Demographic Statistics, 2004* report, produced by Statistics Canada, Demography Division. Populations as of July 1st: preliminary postcensal estimates for 2004.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

B1.5 The prevalence of organized crime

To date, there is little comprehensive statistical information about the extent and nature of organized crime in Canada. Rather, a few studies have focused on specific issues related to the issue. A pilot survey of 16 police services in 1998 attempted to provide insight the characteristics of criminal organizations in Canada (Sauvé, 1999). Among other characteristics, the report found that criminal organizations were most frequently involved in drug trafficking (88% of organizations), followed by extortion (71%), illegal trafficking of firearms (71%), prostitution (63%), vehicle theft (60%), activities related to counterfeiting and fraud (56%), and illegal gambling schemes (50%).

With respect to the involvement of organized crime in motor vehicle theft, Wallace (2004) used the rate of stolen vehicles not recovered as a proxy measure for the involvement of criminal organizations. Based on 2002 data from 22 large police services (which accounted for three-quarters of motor vehicle thefts that year), it was found that about 20% of vehicles stolen in 2002 were never recovered. This compares to a non-recovery rate of about 2% in the early 1970s, according to the Insurance Bureau of Canada (2002). In 2002, the highest rates of non-recovery of stolen vehicles were found in the large urban centres of Quebec and Ontario, as well as the port city of Halifax.

Statistical information on gang-related homicides, meaning homicides reported by the police as occurring as a result of activities involving street gangs or organized crime groups, is also available. According to the Homicide Survey, gang-related homicides increased fairly steadily from 24 (4% of all homicides) in 1994 to a high of 84 (15%) in 2003. In 2004, however, this number decreased to 71 (11%) (Dauvergne, 2005).

Recognizing the need for improved information on organized crime in Canada, the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics has been working with the Federal, Provincial and Territorial Working Group on Organized Crime Research and Analysis to improve measures. In 2001, the CCJS undertook a study to examine options for measuring organized crime in Canada (Ogrodnik, 2002). As a result, beginning in 2005, the latest version of the Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting Survey (UCR2.2) includes the capacity to collect police-reported incidents of organized crime.

B2 Goal 2: Offender accountability, reintegration and rehabilitation

Canadian courts have the responsibility to try accused persons fairly and to impose just sentences on guilty persons that will promote accountability, responsibility and rehabilitation. This includes the use of traditional and non-traditional responses such as community-based alternatives, treatment, and the use of incarceration as appropriate. Prisons and community corrections agencies are charged with overseeing the sentences imposed by the courts. The following measures examined over time can help assess the performance of the criminal justice system with respect to these goals: the type and severity of sentences ordered by courts; the number of offenders participating in restorative justice programs; Canada's use of incarceration compared to other countries; and, rates of recidivism, including re-charging, re-convictions and re-admissions to correctional facilities.


B2.1 Types of sentences ordered in adult court⁵²

Prison was the most serious sentence ordered in more than one-third of convictions in adult courts⁵³

Those found guilty of criminal offences are held accountable for their criminal actions by serving sentences imposed by the courts. In Canada, the sentencing options available to the adult courts fall into five main categories: imprisonment, conditional sentences, probation, fines, or 'other' types of sanctions (see Box B2.1). In 2003/04, prison was the most serious sentence handed down in 91,000 (36%) of the more than 257,000 adult court cases where there was a conviction.⁵⁴ Probation was the most serious sentence ordered for 30% of convicted cases, followed by fines (26%). A conditional sentence, introduced in 1996 as a sentencing option with the enactment of Bill C-41, was the most severe sentence in 5% of convicted cases.⁵⁵ Three percent of convicted cases resulted in "other" types of sentences, meaning an order of restitution, an absolute or conditional discharge, a suspended sentence, payment of legal costs or the suspension of driver's license (Figure B2.1).

Figure B2.1

The relative use of incarceration in adult court remains stable as orders for probation and conditional sentences grow and fines decline¹



1. Percentages are based on the most serious sentence imposed in convicted cases.

2. "Other" types of sanctions include sentencing options, such as restitution, compensation, a conditional or absolute discharge or a suspended sentence.

3. Conditional sentencing was enacted in 1996 and data collection on conditional sentences began in 1998/99.

Note: Data are available from the Adult Criminal Court Survey from 1994/95 at approximately 80% of national adult criminal court caseload. This figure represents the longest trend analysis possible for jurisdictions consistently reporting to the survey during this period (i.e., Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Yukon). Sentencing detail was not available for 17% of convictions in the fourth quarter of 2001/02 and affects 4% of all convictions in Ontario for this reference period.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.

Imprisonment used most often for *Offences Against the Administration of Justice* and serious violent offences

Taking into account the most serious offence, imprisonment was ordered most frequently as the most serious sentence in cases of *Administration of Justice* offences (51% of convictions). This is not surprising given that offences against the *Administration of Justice* overwhelmingly involve those where the accused has failed to comply with court orders (e.g., breach of probation, failure to appear, unlawfully at large). Fines were ordered in 23% of convictions for offences against the *Administration of Justice* and probation in 21%.

Imprisonment was the most serious sentence ordered in 41% of convictions for *Crimes Against Property*. This relatively high use of imprisonment may be explained by the fact that persons committing *Crimes Against Property* tend to have longer criminal histories, and next to the seriousness of the crime, the offender's criminal history is one of the most important factors the court considers when determining the sentence it will impose (Thomas, 2004). Probation was ordered in 37% of convictions for *Crimes Against Property* and fines in 13%.

With respect to convictions for *Crimes Against the Person*, prison was the most serious sentence for about one-third (35%) of convictions and probation was ordered as the most serious sentence in 52%. A factor to consider when examining the use of incarceration for this crime category is that common assault - the least serious form of assault and a crime which accounted for 44% of convictions under *Crimes Against the Person* in 2003/04 - results in incarceration relatively infrequently (24%) and is more

likely to result in probation (62%). Incarceration was far more common for more serious offences under the *Crimes Against the Person* grouping, such as homicide (91%), attempted murder (79%) and robbery (74%). The use of fines for *Crimes Against the Person* were relatively low (4% of convictions).

Box B2.1

Principal Sentencing Options in Canada's Adult Courts

The main types of sanctions that can be imposed by adult courts in Canada include the following:

Imprisonment: This involves a term of custody served in a provincial/territorial or federal institution. Sentences of two years or more are served in a federal penitentiary, while terms of less than two years are served in provincial/territorial correctional facilities. Sentences of 90 days or less can be served intermittently, which usually refers to serving the sentence on weekends. There are a number of offences, such as impaired driving, homicide and offences committed using a firearm, having minimum sentencing provisions outlined in the *Criminal Code of Canada*, which affect the nature and length of sentences imposed.

Conditional sentence: The Sentencing Reform Bill C-41 was enacted in 1996 establishing a new community-based conditional sentencing option as an alternative to incarceration. A conditional sentence is for those who would otherwise receive a term of imprisonment. With a conditional sentence of imprisonment, the execution of the prison sentence is suspended. In terms of seriousness, it is less serious than prison but more serious than a term of probation. Conditional sentences are served in the community under supervision and often include a number of conditions restricting the movement and activities of the offender. Violation of a condition ordered under a conditional sentence can result in immediate suspension of the conditional sentence and imprisonment of the offender.

Probation: An offender receiving a term of probation remains in the community, but is subject to a number of conditions for the duration of the probation order. Some conditions are compulsory and apply to all offenders on probation. These include keeping the peace and appearing before the court when required to do so. The optional conditions vary from case to case, and can include performing community service, abstaining from the consumption of alcohol and attending counselling. Violating the conditions of a probation order is a criminal offence subject to possible prosecution that could result in a maximum sentence of imprisonment of two years.

Fine: When a fine is imposed, the offender is ordered to pay a specific dollar amount to the court. Unless the offender has been convicted of an offence carrying a minimum term of imprisonment, or a maximum penalty of more than 5 years, an offender may be fined in lieu of other types of punishment.

Community Service: A community service order requires the offender to perform unpaid work for the community. The maximum length of a community service order is 240 hours with a maximum term of completion of twelve months.

Other types of sanctions: In addition to these principal sentencing options, the courts can choose a variety of other sentencing options, such as restitution, compensation, a conditional or absolute discharge or a suspended sentence. Multiple sanctions may be imposed, but there are specific rules that govern the types of sentencing options that can be ordered in combination.

Use of prison in adult courts remains stable

Over the last ten years, the proportion of convicted cases where prison was ordered as the most serious sentence has remained fairly stable and the use of probation has increased slightly. In 2003/04, 36% of convictions ended in imprisonment, compared to 34% in 1994/95 (Figure B2.1). Over this same period, probation as the most serious sentence rose steadily from 26% to 30%. In contrast, the use of fines has fallen

steadily from 39% to 26%. Two changes have likely contributed to the decrease in the use of fines. First, changes to the *Criminal Code* came into force in 1996 directing judges to impose fines only after determining if the offender has the ability to pay (CC s. 734(2)). Second, some crimes, such as *Criminal Code Traffic Offences*, are more likely to result in a fine. Over the ten-year trend period, there has been a drop of four percentage points in *Criminal Code Traffic* cases (Thomas, 2004).

Since 1994/95, prison sentences have declined for *Crimes Against the Person* and *Criminal Code Traffic Offences*. That year, 40% of convictions for *Crimes Against the Person* were ordered to serve a term of custody, compared to 35% in 2003/04. The use of probation and conditional sentences in cases of common assault has contributed to this overall shift. For *Criminal Code Traffic Offences*, the proportion ending in a prison sentence has slid steadily from 25% to 18%, a change which is also attributable to an increase in the use of fines and conditional sentences.

The use of prison in convicted cases of *Crimes Against Property* inched up from 37% in 1994/95 to 41% in 2003/04. The use of imprisonment rose four percentage points for *Other Criminal Code Offences* (e.g., weapons offences, disturbing the peace). In 1994/95, 28% of convictions for *Other Criminal Code Offences* resulted in terms of imprisonment, compared to 32% in 2003/04.

With respect to *Other Federal Statute Offences*, the types of sentences handed down have changed dramatically since 1994/95. The proportion of convictions ending in a fine as the most serious sentence plummeted from 70% in 1994/95 to 41% in 2003/04. Meanwhile, use of prison increased from 19% to 24% and all other types of sentences increased as well.

Sentencing patterns in adult courts vary across Canada

Sentencing patterns vary across the country. For example, the use of imprisonment was greatest in Prince Edward Island where prison was the most serious sanction imposed in nearly six out of every ten convicted cases. Ontario and British Columbia had the second highest rates of imprisonments, where four in ten convictions resulted in prison terms. By contrast, Nova Scotia (23%), New Brunswick (24%) and Saskatchewan (24%) reported the lowest incarceration rates.

The use of probation was highest in Quebec where nearly four in ten (38%) convictions resulted in this sentence and rates were lowest in the Yukon (1%) and Prince Edward Island (9%). Regarding the use of fines as the most serious sentence, Alberta (44%) and Saskatchewan (38%) reported the highest rates and Ontario reported the lowest (18%). In 2003/04, use of conditional sentences was greatest in the Yukon Territory, where 12% of convicted cases resulted in a conditional sentence as the most serious sanction, followed by British Columbia (9%) and Saskatchewan (9%).⁵⁶

The use of “other” types of sanctions (e.g., restitution, compensation, a conditional or absolute discharge or a suspended sentence) represented 1% to 5% of convicted cases for most jurisdictions in 2003/04. These types of sentences were imposed in a quarter of all convictions in Yukon courts and 10% of convicted cases in Prince Edward Island.

Variations in sentencing across the country can reflect the influence of a number of factors. For example, the mix of offences being sentenced varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Thus, a larger proportion of more serious offences in a particular jurisdiction may result in a corresponding increase in the use of custody in that jurisdiction. As well, courts in different parts of the country may use incarceration in different ways, electing to impose prison sentences for certain offences for which other courts might tend to impose different sentencing options. This factor is clearly

illustrated by Prince Edward Island's approach to impaired driving where conviction rates for this offence are high and offenders are almost always sentenced to prison. This accounts for the province's high overall rate of incarceration (Thomas, 2004).

B2.2 Types of sentences ordered in youth courts

Canada has a long-standing history of dealing with young offenders differently than adults, including with respect to sentencing. From 1984 to 2003, Canada's policy toward young offenders was guided by the federal *Young Offenders Act (YOA)*. The *Act* was then replaced in April 2003 by the *Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA)*. This new legislation is aimed at reducing the use of youth courts for less serious, non-violent offences through the implementation of extrajudicial sanctions (or alternative measures as they were known under the *YOA*). The *YCJA* also seeks to reduce the use of custody, especially for non-violent offences, and reinforces the importance of non-custodial sentencing alternatives. Under the *YCJA*, there are a number of new sentencing options for youth. Non-custodial alternatives to sentencing include reprimands, intensive support and supervision program orders and attendance orders. New custodial sentences include deferred custody and supervision, and intensive rehabilitative custody and supervision orders. Despite the *YCJA* legislation making no distinction between open and secure custody as did the *YOA*, determination of custody types still lies within the responsibility of the jurisdictions. The *YCJA* states that the determination of open or closed custody is made by the Provincial Director unless, under an Order in Council, the youth courts have been given that responsibility. All jurisdictions had opted for the Order in Council, therefore the level of custody determination in all provinces and territories lies in the hands of the judge. Finally, the provisions guiding transfers to adult court have been amended (see Box B2.3).⁵⁷

Box B2.2

Limitations to the data collected through the Youth Court Survey

Limitations in the national data collected through the Youth Court Survey during the transition from the *YOA* to the *YCJA* affects the type of analysis that can be done with these data in two important ways. Because the new sentencing options available to youth courts as of April 1, 2003 under the *YCJA* were reported by courts as "other" sentences in the 2003/04 survey year, it is not possible to produce information according to the most serious sentence ordered in a case, or to compare sentencing data from the Youth Court Survey for 2003/04 to historical data that predate the *YCJA*.¹ As such, sentencing trends in this report will present data from 1991/92 to 2002/03 using the most serious sentence in a case and information on sentencing activity for 2003/04 under the *YCJA* will be presented separately.

1. For further information see Thomas, Jennifer. 2004, "Youth Court Statistics, 2003/04." *Juristat* 25(4). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.


Probation as the most serious sentence was ordered in almost six in ten youth convictions, custody in over one-quarter of cases

There were more than 50,400 convictions in Canadian youth courts in 2002/03, the last full year of data under the *YOA*. Probation was the most serious sentence⁵⁸ ordered in nearly six out of ten (57%) of these convicted cases. Offenders were sentenced to some type of custody in over one-quarter of convicted cases (14% to secure custody and another 13% to open custody). Fines were the most severe sentence imposed in

6% of youth court convictions and “other” sentences (e.g., compensation, pay purchaser, compensation in kind, restitution, prohibition, seizure or forfeiture, conditional discharge, or absolute discharge) constituted the remaining 10% of sentences (Figure B2.2).

Figure B2.2

The relative use of probation as the most serious sentence in youth court convictions has been growing



Note: Data for 2003/04 are not available by most serious sentence due to the transition to the new sentencing options under the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* which took effect April 1, 2003.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Court Survey.

Box B2.3

Transfers of youth to adult court

Revisions to the YOA in 1995 allowed for a presumed transfer to adult court for the most serious violent crime cases. This provision applied to murder (first or second degree), manslaughter, attempted murder and aggravated sexual assault. For these offences, the onus was on the accused to make an application to have the case heard in youth court. For other crimes, the Crown or defence counsel could apply for a transfer to adult court. The condition stipulated in the Act for these transfers specified a minimum age requirement of 14 years. Thirty cases were transferred to adult court in 2002/03 (less than 0.1% of total cases). The majority of cases transferred to adult court involved *Crimes Against the Person* (17 cases).

Under the YCJA, rather than youth being transferred to adult court, all proceedings take place in the youth justice court. However, under the current provisions of the legislation, Youth Court judges can impose an adult sentence if the case meets certain conditions. In other words, a youth may still be subject to adult penalties for very serious offences, but the decision to do so takes place following trial and conviction rather than at the pre-trial stage. To impose an adult sentence, the offence committed must carry a maximum sentence of two years in adult court and the youth must have been 14 years or older when the offence was committed (jurisdictions have the option of raising this minimum to 16 years of age). For youth who are charged with murder, manslaughter, attempted murder, or aggravated sexual assault, or who are standing trial for a serious violent offence and have been convicted of a violent offence on at least two other occasions, the presumption is that an adult sentence will apply and that the burden of proof is on the convicted youth to show that a youth sentence would be more appropriate (Robinson, 2004).

Taking into account the most serious offence being sentenced in a case, probation was the most serious sentence ordered in the majority of cases of *Crimes Against the Person* (67%), *Crimes Against Property* (64%) and *Other Criminal Code* convictions (63%). As with adult courts, the high rate of probation for *Crimes Against the Person* is driven by sentencing for common assault – the least serious form of assault – which accounts for almost one-third of convictions for *Crimes Against the Person*. *Crimes Against the Administration of Justice* were more likely to result in sentences of custody (45%) than probation (35%). Youth convicted of *Criminal Code Traffic* offences were more likely to receive a fine (40%) or probation (39%) as the most serious sentence. Probation (41%) and custody (31%) were the most common sentences for offences against other federal statutes overall, a pattern driven by the high volume of offences against the *Young Offenders Act*.

In terms of the most serious sentence, custody, either open or closed, was ordered most frequently for homicide (79%), attempted homicide (71%), robbery (45%), prostitution (44%) and being unlawfully at large (89%).

From 1991/92 to 2002/03, the use of probation as the most serious sentence, relative to other sentences, rose

From 1991/92 (when youth court statistics were first available) to 2002/03, the use of custody as the most serious sentence has remained relatively stable, the use of probation as the most serious sentence has grown, the use of fines has declined slightly and the use of “other” sanctions has dropped markedly (Figure B2.2). This pattern is seen across all types of offences. Sentencing patterns in youth court shifted in 1993/94 when probation, as the most serious sentence, grew to represent over half (51%) of all sentences imposed in 1993/94 (up from 44% in 1991/92 and 43% in 1992/93) and the proportion of “other” sanctions dipped to just 13% (compared to 22% in 1991/92 and 23% in 1992/93).

In more recent years, the relative use of probation as the most serious sentence has risen modestly and by 2002/03, 57% of youth court convictions ended in a term of probation as the most serious sentence (Figure B2.2). Overall, in each of the twelve years from 1991/92 to 2002/03, probation remained the most prevalent sentence imposed in youth court. These overall trends are across all types of offences.

Sentencing under the YCJA in 2003/04

When accounting for multiple sentences in a case and not just the most serious sentence, probation continued to account for the majority of sentences. In 2003/04, probation was ordered in 63% of the 40,184 convicted cases (Table B2.1), a decrease from 70% the previous year. This decrease may be partially attributable to the fact that under the *YOA*, custodial sentences for youth were often followed by a period of probation. Under the *YCJA*, however, youth custody sentences have a mandatory period of supervision on release that is built into the sentence. Also, cases that would likely have received terms of probation under the *YOA* may have received some sort of extrajudicial measure under the *YCJA* in 2003/04 (Thomas, 2005).

Community service was the second most common sentence in youth court with 28% of convicted cases receiving such a sentence in 2003/04. Other sanctions, which include deferred custody and supervision, intensive support and supervision, attendance at non-residential programs, compensation, restitution, conditional or absolute discharge and reprimands, were ordered in 36% of guilty cases. Fines were imposed in just 6% of all convicted cases.

Sentencing in youth courts varies across the provinces and territories

Variations in reporting to police, in procedures and eligibility requirements for police diversion and alternative measures programs, and differences in provincial policy directing Crown discretion will influence the volume and characteristics of cases heard in youth courts in each of the provinces and territories. Hence, factors such as these should be considered and caution taken when making inter-jurisdictional comparisons (Robinson 2004).

In 2002/03, custodial sentences as the most serious sentence in a youth court case were most common in the Yukon Territory (50% of convicted cases), followed by Prince Edward Island (41%), the Northwest Territories (40%) and Newfoundland and Labrador (39%) (Table B2.2). In the Yukon Territory, one-quarter of youth court convictions were sentenced to secure custody and the same proportion received an open custody sentence. Custody was used least often in Alberta (20%) and Quebec (22%). These differences in the use of custody across Canada are due to a variety of factors such as jurisdictional variations in the use of pre-charge screening and diversion, the types of offences sentenced, rates of re-offending and the availability of custodial facilities (Robinson, 2004).

While probation was the most serious sentence imposed in a majority of jurisdictions across the country, this was particularly so in Ontario, New Brunswick, British Columbia and Nunavut. In nearly two-thirds (64%) of youth convictions in Ontario, probation was the most serious sentence issued. In New Brunswick, British Columbia and Nunavut, six out of ten youth case convictions received probation as the most serious sentence. Yukon (29%) and Alberta (38%) had the smallest proportions of cases with probation as the most serious sentence imposed. Alberta youth courts issued the largest proportions of fines (19%) and 'other' sentences (23%) such as compensation, restitution, conditional discharge, or absolute discharge.

Although analysis of sentences by the most serious sentence in a case under the *YCJA* for 2003/04 is not possible due to changes in sentencing categories, the available data suggest that there remains variability across the provinces and territories in terms of sentencing. In 2003/04, Alberta, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and Quebec were the provinces least likely to impose an order of custody. Following the national trend, in 2003/04, all jurisdictions reported a decrease from 2002/03 in the proportion of convicted cases ordered to probation. Nevertheless, probation remained frequently ordered in all jurisdictions.

B2.3 Severity of sentences ordered in adult court⁵⁹

Nine in ten prison terms imposed by adult courts were for 12 months or less

In 2003/04, for 93% of the 90,900 adult convictions for which the length of the prison sentences was known⁶⁰, a term of one year or less was imposed. About three-quarters (78%) of prison sentences were three months or less, 10% were between 3 months plus a day and 6 months, and 5% were between 6 months plus a day and 1 year. Adult court cases in which offenders were sentenced to more than a year in prison represented 7% of all convictions, with 4% of terms being two years or more. The mean (i.e. average) length of custodial sentences imposed in 2003/04 was 115 days.

Prison terms for convictions in *Crimes Against the Person* cases tended to be harsher than for other crime categories. In 2003/04, about 9% of the prison terms imposed for *Crimes Against the Person* convictions were for 24 months or longer and the mean length of custodial sentences was 223 days. In comparison, 4% of prison sentences for *Crimes Against Property* cases were more than two years and the same was true for prison

terms for *Other Criminal Code* cases. Prison sentences for *Criminal Code Traffic* cases were rarely more than 2 years (1%), but were more common for *Other Federal Statute* cases (7%), particularly drug trafficking (11%).

Box B2.4

Using mean and median values to analyze sentence length

Mean and median are measures of central tendency. While the mean is an average value of all observations in a set of data, the median represents the midpoint of all the observations in a sorted set of data, where exactly half the dataset are above and half are below the midpoint.

The median may be influenced by data sets that are not normally distributed, such as sentencing which clusters around a number of specific time intervals or dollar amounts. For example, custody sentences are typically imposed for periods of weeks or months (e.g., 15 days, 30 days, 45 days, 180 days, etc.). The movement of the median value from one cluster to another may indicate a large increase or decrease in sentencing trends when other measures of central tendency indicate a more subtle change. In addition, the trend line of median values may indicate stability when the change in sentencing patterns are too small to cause the movement of the median value from one sentencing cluster to another. The mean is less affected by the clustering of observations in a data set. However, the mean can be affected by the presence of extreme values.

Because the mean and median are subject to different influences, both the mean and median values have been presented in the figures and tables on sentence length and fine amount. This provides a more complete picture of sentencing in adult and youth courts.


The length of adult prison sentences has declined slightly

The overall distribution of prison terms by sentence length remained fairly consistent from 1994/95 to 2003/04. However, prison terms of one month or less have come to represent a larger proportion of sentences in more recent years. Adult offenders sentenced to one month in custody or less constituted 49% of all prison sentences in both 1997/98 and 1998/99 and represented 57% of all custody sentences in 2003/04. Conversely, the proportion of sentences greater than a month up to one year has declined, dropping from 44% of all prison sentences in each year from 1995/96 to 1998/99, to 36% of all prison terms in 2003/04.

This increase in the proportion of convicted cases with shorter prison terms is also reflected in the decrease in the mean length of custodial sentences. Between 1994/95 and 1998/99, the mean length of custodial sentences issued in adult courts rose from 116 days to a peak of 139 days, but in more recent years has been on the decline, dropping in each of the past five years to return to 1994/95 levels (Figure B2.3). Despite a general trend toward decreasing sentence lengths, the mean custodial term for certain crimes, such as 'other' sexual offences and impaired driving, have increased in recent years.

Figure B2.3

Over the last five years, the average length of adult custodial sentences has declined



1. The median represents the mid-point of a group of values when all the values are sorted by size.

Notes: Time in custody is taken into consideration when imposing a sentence. The length of time in custody prior to sentencing and the extent to which it influences the sanction imposed are not available from the ACCS. The data presented exclude cases where the length of prison sentence was unknown, which constituted 7% of all convicted cases with a prison sentence in 2003/04. Prison is the most serious sentence that can be ordered by the courts. Data are available from the Adult Criminal Court Survey from 1994/95 at approximately 80% of national adult criminal court caseload. This figure represents the longest trend analysis possible for jurisdictions consistently reporting to the survey during this period (i.e., Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Yukon).


Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.

Length of custodial sentences for adult offenders varies across the country

The use of imprisonment and the length of custodial sentences differ greatly across Canada. It appears that jurisdictions that impose custodial sentences more frequently are more likely to order shorter terms of imprisonment. For instance, despite having a high incarceration rate overall where 58% of guilty cases ended in a term of imprisonment, adult courts in Prince Edward Island tended to order shorter custodial sentences than adult courts in other jurisdictions. As mentioned earlier, this is largely related to Prince Edward Island's approach to cases of impaired driving (see section B2.1). In 2003/04, 88% of convicted cases in Prince Edward Island were sentenced to three months or less and just 4% of prison terms were for more than one year. The mean length of prison sentences in Prince Edward Island was 71 days (Figure B2.4). Other provinces that had higher than average incarceration rates, such as Ontario and British Columbia, also reported some of the lower mean lengths of prison. In contrast, provinces such as Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia that reported the lowest incarceration rates reported higher average lengths of imprisonment relative to other jurisdictions.⁶¹

Figure B2.4

Mean and median prison terms imposed in adult courts vary across the country, 2003/04



1. The median represents the mid-point of a group of values when all the values are sorted by size.
2. Because Quebec does not report data from municipal courts, which account for one quarter of federal statute charges in that province, caution should be used when comparing sentence lengths in Quebec to other jurisdictions.


Notes: Time in custody is taken into consideration when imposing a sentence. The length of time in custody prior to sentencing and the extent to which it influences the sanction imposed are not available from the ACCS. The data presented exclude cases where the length of prison sentence was unknown, which constituted 7% of all convicted cases with a prison sentence in 2003/04. Prison is the most serious sentence that can be ordered by the courts. Data for the Northwest Territories was unavailable for 2003/04. Manitoba and Nunavut do not report to the ACCS.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.

Eight out of ten probation terms imposed by adult courts were between six and twenty-four months

In 2003/04, nearly half (48%) of all probation terms were for periods between six months plus one day and one year. A further third (32%) of probation terms were for periods between one year plus one day and two years. There is a statutory limit of three years on probation terms issued by adult courts and only 6% of probation orders exceeded 2 years.

In adult court cases where a sentence of probation was ordered, the mean length of that sentence was 460 days. However for certain categories of crime, the length of probation was notably longer. The mean length of probation for convictions for homicide (759 days), attempted murder (732 days), robbery (679 days), sexual assault (648 days), other sexual offences (762 days), criminal harassment (637 days) and other crimes against persons (621 days) were the longest. Probation sentences imposed for drug possession, disturbing the peace and *Young Offenders Act* violations were all less than a year and among the shortest received.

Figure B2.5**The mean length of probation terms in adult court gradually declined between 1995/96 and 2003/04**

Notes: Data are available from the Adult Criminal Court Survey from 1994/95 at approximately 80% of national adult criminal court caseload. This figure represents the longest trend analysis possible for jurisdictions consistently reporting to the survey during this period (i.e., Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Yukon). The data exclude cases where the length of probation sentence was unknown. In 2003/04, these sentences represented 1% of all convicted cases with a probation sentence. Probation totals include mandatory probation for cases given a conditional discharge (approximately 5% of convictions) or a suspended sentence (approximately 14% of convictions).

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.


From 1994/95 to 2003/04, the length of probation sentences ordered by adult courts has changed modestly. Over this ten-year period, sentences between six months plus one day and one year were consistently the most common probation terms, followed by orders for a period between one year plus one day and two years. However, the overall mean number of days for probation orders declined. In 1994/95, the mean probation length was 472 days and rose to 494 days the following year. Since 1995/96 the mean length for probation has been on a gradual decline and by 2003/04 it had dropped to 460 days (Figure B2.5).

Across the provinces and territories, adult court probation orders in Quebec and Prince Edward Island were, on the whole, lengthier. In 2003/04, both jurisdictions ordered probation terms greater than one year for more than one-half of all cases sentenced to probation. The mean length of probation for Quebec was 586 days and for Prince Edward Island it was 505 days. In contrast, Saskatchewan had the largest percentage of convicted cases with probation terms of six months or less and a mean probation length of 321 days.

Fines for drug-trafficking were often among the highest imposed by adult courts

In 2003/04, nearly half (46%) of all adult court fines were more than \$500 and the mean amount of fines for cases convicted in adult courts was \$768, up from \$742 the previous year. A similar proportion (42%) of fines was \$300 or less. With a mean fine of \$782, fines for offences within the *Criminal Code Traffic* category (especially convicted cases of impaired driving which had a mean fine of \$794) were generally higher than fines for other offences. Fines imposed in convicted cases of drug trafficking were often among the highest across all offences, with a mean fine amount of \$1,524.⁶² Fines for convictions of *Administration of Justice* offences tended to be among the lowest, with a mean amount of \$241.

Figure B2.6
Fines ordered in adult courts have become more costly



1. In order to create constant dollar figures with the effects of inflation removed, figures were converted to a base of 1992=100 using Statistics Canada's Consumer Price Index (CPI). Information the consumer price index for Canada, the provinces and territories can be obtained at http://www40.statcan.ca/101/ind01/12_3956.htm.

2. The median represents the mid-point of a group of values when all the values are sorted by size.

Notes: Data do not include charges resulting in conviction where sentencing information was unavailable. Data represent all convictions receiving a sentence, regardless of whether or not it was the most serious sentence.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.

While the imposition of fines by adult courts has generally been decreasing, the size of the fines imposed has been moving slightly upward. Taking inflation into account, fines issued by adult criminal courts in 1994/95 averaged \$491 and increased to \$721 by 1999/00 (Figure B2.6). The average amount of fines spiked in 2000/01 due to an increase in the proportion of fines greater than \$1,000, which were imposed in Quebec. In more recent years, fine amounts have been inching upwards to reach an inflation-adjusted average of \$628.

As there are jurisdictional variations in the extent to which fines are issued, there are also differences in the fine amounts that are typically imposed. Mean fine amounts in 2003/04 ranged from \$538 in Saskatchewan to \$1,018 in Ontario. While Saskatchewan adult courts had the lowest mean fine amount, still nearly half (46%) of all fines issued in convicted cases in that province exceeded \$500. Though Ontario had the highest mean fine amount, the median fine amount for that province was just \$600 in 2003/04, suggesting that there were a few cases with exceptionally high fine amounts.

B2.4 Severity of sentences ordered in youth court

Youth custodial sentences have become shorter


In 2003/04 under the *YCJA*, 49% of cases resulting in custody and supervision were sentenced to terms of less than one month. While less than one-third (29%) were for a periods of one to three months, 16% were for terms greater than three months and up to six months. Fewer than one in ten (6%) cases resulting in custody and supervision were ordered to more than 6 months. The average sentence length was 67 days.

Similar to patterns in adult criminal courts, the most severe custodial terms were typically found among *Crimes Against the Person* convictions. In 2003/04, the average custodial sentence for *Crimes Against the Person* cases was 99 days, with youth convicted of homicide receiving an average term of 1,052 days (or just under three years). Sentences for *Administration of Justice* and *Other Federal Statutes* convictions were among the least severe, with mean sentence lengths of 34 and 38 days, respectively. *Other Federal Statute Offences* mostly consisted of offences against the *YOA* and *YCJA*, which are largely offences against the administration of justice.

Overall, under the *YOA* custodial sentences became shorter (Figure B2.7) and, on average, did not change significantly under the first year of the *YCJA*. Under the *YOA*, the mean sentence length for secure custody terms was 95 days in 1991/92, and after declining consistently in each of the subsequent years, reached 68 days by 2002/03. Similarly, the mean length of open custody sentences was 90 days in 1991/92, falling to 66 days by 2002/03. In addition, with the notable drop in the mean sentence length for secure custody terms in 1997/98, the terms for secure and open custody sentences have converged in more recent years. The *YCJA* does not distinguish between secure and open custody and in 2003/04, the mean sentence length for the new provision for custody and supervision was 67 days.

Figure B2.7

Mean length of youth custody sentences declined under the *Young Offenders Act*, especially for secure custody



Note: Data for 2003/04 are not presented because the new sentencing options under the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* which took effect April 1, 2003 define custody differently, therefore the data are not comparable to previous years.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Court Survey.

Jurisdictions that use incarceration less frequently tend to impose longer sentences

Overall, sentences to custody in 2003/04 ranged from an average high of 175 days in the Northwest Territories to a low of 41 days in British Columbia (Table B2.3). It appears that jurisdictions that are less likely to sentence youth to custody tend to impose longer sentences when they do. For instance, in 2003/04, sentences to custody were longest in Quebec and Nova Scotia, with mean sentence lengths of 133 and 93 days, respectively, compared to a national average of 67 days. These two jurisdictions were among those least likely to sentence youth to secure custody.

Most probation terms imposed by youth courts were more than six months long

Over eight in ten probation terms (84%) ordered in 2003/04 were for a period of more than six months.⁶³ Specifically, 58% ranged from greater than six months to twelve months and another 26% were ordered to a term of more than 12 months. Only 16% of cases with a sentence to probation were ordered to a term of six months or less. In 2003/04, the mean probation length for cases sentenced to a term of probation was 381 days, compared to 375 days in the previous year.

At 406 days, the mean length of probation was longest for those convicted of *Crimes Against the Person*, followed by *Criminal Code Traffic* convictions (393 days). In particular, the longest terms were ordered for the more serious violent crimes, such as homicide (483 days), robbery (440), sexual assault (532) and other sexual offences (527), and major assault (410). Convictions for *Crimes Against Property* that were sentenced to probation received an average term of 378 days while those convicted of offences against the *Administration of Justice* were ordered an average probation term of 357 days. Case convictions for *Other Criminal Code* offences, which include weapons and prostitution offences, disturbing the peace and other offences, received an average probation term of 384 days.

Probation terms have grown fairly steadily over the last 13 years

Over the 13-year period from 1991/92 to 2003/04, the mean sentence for probation grew by 65 days, rising from 316 to 381 days. Despite some annual fluctuations, probation terms have grown an average of five days per year since 1991/92.


Across the country, the mean sentence for probation in 2003/04 ranged from 256 days in the Yukon Territory to 480 days in Manitoba (Table B2.3). In addition to having the longest mean sentence length, almost half (48%) of the probation sentences imposed in Manitoba were longer than one year, compared to 26% nationally. Ontario (424 days), Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador (403 days, each) also had relatively long average probation terms. In addition to the Yukon Territory, the mean length for probation was also comparatively low in Alberta (299), British Columbia (319) and Saskatchewan (321).

The mean fine amount for *Criminal Code Traffic* convictions was more than twice the average fine amount for all offences combined

Most of the fines imposed in Canada's youth courts were for amounts of \$300 or less. In fact, for every ten fines imposed in 2003/04, eight were for amounts not exceeding \$300. Less than 1% of fines imposed in 2003/04 were for more than \$1,000. The mean fine amount for 2003/04 (expressed in current dollars) was \$219. On average, the highest fines were imposed for *Criminal Code Traffic* convictions (\$462). In particular, impaired driving cases had a mean fine amount of \$486.

From 1991/92 to 2003/04, the average amount for fines ordered in youth courts has grown overall (Figure B2.8). Controlling for the effects of inflation, fines imposed by youth courts in 1991/92 averaged at \$154 and reached an average of \$179 in 2003/04.

Figure B2.8
Youth court fines fairly stable in recent years, but higher than 12 years ago



1. In order to create constant dollar figures with the effects of inflation removed, figures were converted to a base of 1992=100 using Statistics Canada's Consumer Price Index (CPI). Information the consumer price index for Canada, the provinces and territories can be obtained at http://www40.statcan.ca/101/ind01/12_3956.htm.
2. The median represents the mid-point of a group of values when all the values are sorted by size.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Court Survey.

Average fine amounts for youth courts ranged from \$100 in Newfoundland and Labrador to \$377 in Prince Edward Island

In 2003/04, among the provinces, the highest fines were ordered in the youth courts of Prince Edward Island, where almost one half (47%) of fines exceeded \$300 and the mean amount was \$377 (Table B2.3). Fines imposed by youth courts in Manitoba and New Brunswick were also among the highest in the country, with mean amounts of \$329 and \$269, respectively. In contrast, average fines issued by Newfoundland and Labrador youth courts (\$100) and Alberta youth courts (\$188) were the lowest in Canada.

B2.5 Number of offenders participating in Restorative Justice Programs

Restorative justice focuses on the notion of repairing harm caused by crime on both an individual and societal level. While there is no universally accepted definition of restorative justice, one definition suggests that:

Restorative justice is an approach to justice that focuses on repairing the harm caused by crime while holding the offender responsible for his or her actions, by providing an opportunity for the parties directly affected by a crime – victim(s), offender and community – to identify and address their needs in the aftermath of a crime, and seek a resolution that affords healing, reparation and reintegration, and prevents future harm (Cormier, 2002).

The principles of restorative justice in Canada are supported by many faith-based, religious and spiritual groups and contain elements that are consistent with Aboriginal models of conflict resolution. Recent amendments to the *Criminal Code* have endorsed the use of non-custodial sentences for both adults and youth, with particular attention to the circumstances of Aboriginal offenders, where individualized cases would allow for a more restorative approach to sentencing (*Criminal Code of Canada*, Sec. 718.2 (e)). Also, in *R. v. Gladue* (1999), the Supreme Court of Canada

upheld the notion of restorative justice and found that “healing is an Aboriginal justice principle which is slowly becoming merged into Canadian criminal law...” (Turpel-Lafond, 1999).

Specifically for young people, the *Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA)* states that a focus on rehabilitation and reintegration into society should be paramount in sentencing. Moreover, a youth justice court should consider alternatives to custody, when reasonable in the circumstances, with particular attention to the circumstances of Aboriginal young persons (*YCJA*, Sections 38 and 39).

In 2000, a Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group on Restorative Justice identified three core program models which are typical practices in restorative justice: victim-offender reconciliation/mediation, family group conferencing, and circles (sentencing circles, healing circles, releasing circles, etc.). Although restorative justice programs exist in various forms in most provinces and territories in Canada, no national data on the extent to which offenders participate in these programs are currently available. As found by Johnson (2003), a main barrier to data collection with respect to restorative justice programs is defining what constitutes a restorative justice program, particularly since restorative justice ideas and principles are incorporated into non-restorative justice programs such as alternative measures and community justice.

However, through the Victim Services Survey there are some national data on the number of victim service agencies that were directly involved in the coordination and/or delivery of restorative justice processes for criminal justice matters⁶⁴ in 2002/03. Of the 484 agencies that responded to the survey, 82 (17%) indicated that they were involved in the coordination and delivery of such services. Involvement was highest among police-based victim services (27%) and lowest among sexual assault centres (2%).

B2.6 Canada’s incarceration rate compared to other countries


The comparison of international imprisonment rates is complex and should be approached with caution. There are a number of factors that make comparability problematic (Johnson, 2004). First, countries differ in how their criminal justice systems operate and may define their prison populations differently from other countries by, for instance, including young offenders and remands in their counts while others exclude one or both of these groups. Second, the methods used to calculate incarceration rates can differ from one country to another. In calculating rates, different units can be used to measure the “imprisoned” population, such as the average daily count of inmates or a count from a “snapshot” survey day. Also, different units can be used for the population against which the risk of incarceration is measured (i.e. the denominator). This unit could be a country’s total population, a subset of a country’s total population (e.g. only people who are old enough to be prosecuted), or even the number of people charged with an offence. Differences such as these can have a significant impact on rates of imprisonment.

As comparisons of incarceration rates are not advisable, comparing changes in incarceration over time is an alternative barometer to examine differences in the use of incarceration among countries (Johnson, 2004). For Canada and 14 other countries, Figure B2.9 shows the change in incarceration rates in 2001 compared to 1993. Canada is among the six nations that recorded a decline in their rate of imprisonment between the reference years. In absolute terms, Canada recorded the largest drop with rates falling 15 points from 131 incarcerated persons per 100,000 total population to 116. Other nations that reported declines were Finland, Denmark, France, Austria and Sweden. For countries that have lower rates overall, percentage changes appear large

despite small changes in absolute terms. Examples of this include Denmark (-11 points in its incarceration rate) and Finland (-12 points). Among the eight countries that reported increases in their incarceration rates between 1993 and 2001, absolute changes in rates ranged from a growth of 5 points in Scotland to 169 points in the United States.

Figure B2.9

Canada among western countries whose incarceration rates have declined between 1993 to 2001¹



1. This figure originally appeared in Johnson, Sara. "Adult Correctional Services in Canada, 2002/03." *Juristat* Vol. 24, no. 10. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Minister of Industry. Figures in parentheses indicate 2001 incarceration rates. These rates are calculated using the total population as the denominator. Due to differences in the operation of criminal justice systems and variations in methods used to calculate incarceration rates across countries, direct comparisons of these rates is not advisable.
2. Represents percentage change from 1994 to 2001 due to the unavailability of 1993 data.

Sources: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, and; *World Prison Brief of the International Centre for Prison Studies*, available at www.prisonstudies.org. *World Prison Population List* (fifth edition), Research Findings No. 166, Home Office Research, United Kingdom.

Demographic shifts, changes in crime rates and the introduction of new criminal justice policy are all factors that can affect a nation's incarceration rate. In Canada, the decline in the incarceration rate coincides with two notable events: a drop in the crime rate that began in the early 1990s, and the introduction of conditional sentences in 1996, which had the explicit goal of reducing the use of incarceration. Rather than serving their sentences in prison, conditional sentences allow offenders to complete their sentences in the community (Johnson, 2004).

Similarly, rising incarceration rates in the England and Wales and the United States correspond with important changes in criminal justice policy. Between 1992 and 2001, a number of legislative changes were implemented in England and Wales which increased minimum sentences and created mandatory sentencing for specific crimes, thereby contributing to the increased use of incarceration in that country (Chapman and Niven, 2000; Johnson, 2004). In the United States, increases in incarceration rates between 1992 and 2001 may be traced to the policy changes evolving out of the "get tough on crime" model implemented during the 1980s and 1990s (Ditton and Wilson, 1999; Johnson, 2004).

B2.7 Rates of recidivism, including re-charging, re-convictions, and re-admission to correctional facilities

The extent to which offenders re-offend, known as the rate of recidivism, is an important issue for the public, for policy-makers and for those working in the field of criminal justice. Recidivism is often used to measure the success of the justice system to rehabilitate or reintegrate offenders into the community. Measuring recidivism, however, is often complex because of the various ways of measuring it and the fact that measurements are often determined by the availability of data. The definition of recidivism in its broadest sense is the number of individuals who re-offend, regardless of whether or not they are detected by the authorities.

The measurement of recidivism using available data can be presented as, for example, rates of re-charging, re-convictions or re-admissions to correctional facilities. Each of these measures provides a different picture of an offender's return to criminal activity and the meaningfulness of the results depends on the research questions being posed. Using arrests as an indicator of recidivism tends to yield the highest rates, while incarceration measures show the lowest rates (Bonta et. al, 2003). There are many important factors to consider in measuring recidivism, including, but not limited to, defining what constitutes a return to crime, choosing an appropriate length of time to follow-up on offenders' return to crime, and selecting a suitable offender population to follow.

Several studies have explored the subject of recidivism in Canada using a variety of measurements. A 2002 Statistics Canada report using prior convictions as a measure for recidivism found that 60% of the nearly 57,000 offenders between 18 and 25 years of age who were convicted in adult criminal court in 1999/00 had at least one previous conviction, either in adult criminal court or youth court (Thomas, Hurley and Grimes, 2002).⁶⁵ Among recidivists identified in this study, 28% had one prior conviction and 72% had multiple convictions. Eight in ten recidivists convicted in property crime cases in 1999/00 had a previous conviction for a property crime. For those convicted of a crime against the person, 53% had a previous conviction for the same type of crime. The report also found that longer criminal histories were related a greater likelihood of prison sentences.

Another Canadian study examined the reconviction rates of federal offenders only (Bonta et al., 2003). This study examined recidivism in terms of any new conviction for an offence committed within two years of release from a federal prison in Canada. Its sample included all releases from federal custody during the fiscal years 1994/95, 1995/96 and 1996/97. The study found that reconviction rates among this group of federal offenders were comparable with those reported internationally using a similar methodology. The reconviction rate for the first fiscal year release cohort was 44%, 43% for the second release cohort and 41% for the third cohort. The study also found that non-violent reconvictions accounted for the majority of the reconvictions, that Aboriginal offenders showed higher reconviction rates than non-Aboriginal offenders and that the reconviction rate for males was higher than that for females.

A recent pilot study established a method for exploring the extent to which offenders in Canada returned to correctional services following release (Johnson, 2005).⁶⁶ The study examines "re-involvement" in correctional services following a continuous period of previous involvement in correctional services and employs the statistical method of survival analysis to track patterns of re-involvement.⁶⁷ The scope of this pilot study was restricted to adult offenders under provincial supervision in Saskatchewan. It examined those released from all involvement during the fiscal year 1999/00 and their re-involvement until the end of fiscal year March 31, 2004.

This pilot study found that among those adults released from the supervision of Saskatchewan correctional services within the fiscal year 1999/00, 47% were re-involved with the province's correctional services by March 31, 2004. In general, the study found there was a rapid increase in re-involvement within the first 12 months, with approximately 22% of offenders returning during this period. Rates of re-involvement were much higher among Aboriginal than non-Aboriginal offenders. By the end of fourth year, more than one-half (57%) of Aboriginal offenders had returned to correctional services, compared to just over one-quarter (28%) of non-Aboriginal offenders. According to the results of the study, the following characteristics of the offender profile were related to rates of re-involvement: sex, age, nature of the re-involvement (i.e. community only, custody only, community and custody), number of criminogenic needs identified, most serious offence type and the number of previous correctional involvements.

B3 Goal 3: Public trust, confidence, and respect for the criminal justice system

Public trust, confidence and respect for the justice system are essential to ensure continued public participation and support. One component of this is public satisfaction with the work of the police, courts, correctional and parole systems and the public's perception of personal safety from crime. The following indicators are presented to provide insight into this component: levels of public and victim satisfaction with police, courts, correctional and parole systems, levels of satisfaction with personal safety, and levels of fear of crime among victims and non-victims.

Another component of this goal of the justice system is the efficiency of the system in processing cases. The efficiency of the criminal justice system in processing cases can work to foster feelings of trust, confidence and respect for the justice system among Canadians. Processing crime through the justice system will be measured in terms of police clearance rates, court case process time and counts of adults in custodial remand.

B3.1 Public and victim satisfaction with police, courts, and correctional and parole systems⁶⁸

In order for the public to come forward as both victims and witnesses of crime and for a justice system to be effective, the public must have confidence and trust in the system. Therefore, an important measure of the performance of the criminal justice system is the extent to which Canadians are satisfied with the work of the police, courts, prison, and parole systems.

The 2003 General Social Survey (GSS) on Social Engagement found that 82% of Canadians felt either a great deal or a lot of confidence in the police and 57% held the same sentiments regarding the "justice system and courts".⁶⁹ This compares to only 41% having the same level of confidence in the welfare system and 43% in the federal parliament. About two-thirds of Canadians expressed confidence in banks (68%), the health care system (67%) and the school system (65%).

Canadians continue to rate the police as doing a good job

Most recently, the 2004 General Social Survey on Victimization also showed that Canadians hold fairly positive attitudes towards the work of police. When asked in 2004 to rate the performance of their local police, almost two-thirds (65%) of Canadians rated the police as doing a good job at being approachable and about six in ten felt the police were doing a good job at ensuring citizen safety (61%) and enforcing laws (59%) (Table B3.1) (Gannon, 2005). Slightly more than one-half (52%) of those surveyed felt that the police were doing a good job responding to calls promptly. Regarding supplying information on the reduction of crime, half of Canadians felt that they were doing a good job.

Overall, levels of satisfaction with police performance have not changed much over time (Table B3.2). However, the proportion of Canadians who felt the police were doing a good job with respect to responding to calls increased five percentage

points from 1993. On the other hand, opinions on police performance with respect to supplying information to reduce crime dipped four percentage points in 2004 after increasing in 1999.

While still critical, public perceptions of the courts and the prison system have improved

According to the 2004 GSS, Canadians viewed the courts and the correctional and parole systems less favourably than police. Previous research has found that as the public becomes more distanced from the various sectors of the justice system, their attitudes are more likely to be influenced by media accounts (Doob and Roberts, 1982; Roberts and Stalans, 1997; DeKeseredy and Schwartz, 1996; Surette 1998, Ericson, Baranek and Chan, 1991; and, Roberts, J., 1992).

First, looking at attitudes towards the criminal courts, over one-quarter (27%) of Canadians felt that the courts were doing a good job at determining whether the accused was guilty, 20% indicated that they believed that the courts were doing a good job at helping the victim and 15% felt that the courts provide justice quickly (Table B3.1). In the case of the criminal courts ensuring a fair trial for the accused, 44% felt that the courts were doing a good job. Compared to 1993, opinions regarding the courts have improved on all levels, particularly with respect to helping the victim (up 8 percentage points), determining whether or not the accused is guilty (up 7 percentage points) and providing justice quickly (+5 percentage points) (Table B3.2).

While Canadians were not as satisfied with the performance of the prison system as they were with the work of the police, opinions have improved. In 2004, 31% of Canadians considered the prison system to be doing a good job at supervising and controlling prisoners, compared to 26% in 1999 (Tables B3.1 and B3.2). Further, 18% indicated that they felt that the prison system was doing a good job at helping prisoners become law-abiding citizens, compared to 14% in 1999.

Canadians continue to be critical of the parole system

In 2004, the parole system received the lowest rating among the criminal justice sectors whereby just 17% of Canadians stated that the parole system did a good job at releasing offenders who are not likely to re-offend and 15% felt the system did a good job at supervising offenders on parole. Overall, about one-third of Canadians felt that the parole system was doing a poor job. There was a modest increase in the proportion of the population 15 years and older who felt the parole system was doing a good job (Table B3.2).

Residents of the Atlantic provinces are more likely to view the criminal justice system positively than those living in western Canada

Levels of satisfaction with the criminal justice system are not uniform across the country. In general, those living in the Atlantic provinces⁷⁰ are more likely to view the criminal justice system favorably, while those living in western⁷¹ provinces hold less positive attitudes. For example, according to the 2004 GSS, a high proportion of Atlantic residents felt the police were doing a good job of being approachable (responses ranging from 72% to 75%), compared to those in the western provinces (64% to 67%) (Table B3.3).

As with attitudes toward policing, attitudes between Atlantic and western Canada also differed when assessing the criminal courts and the prison and parole systems. However, unlike 1999 when the Atlantic provinces consistently provide more favourable opinions of the criminal justice system, the gap in opinions between Atlantic and

western Canada narrowed in some areas with respect to police and courts (Gannon, 2005).

A possible explanation for the overall difference between Atlantic and western Canada in levels of satisfaction with the justice system could be the extent to which people residing in these regions have contact with the criminal justice system. For instance, both the 1999 and the 2004 GSS show that those who have had contact with the police in any way were less likely to feel that the police were doing a good job (Gannon, 2005; Tufts, 2000). According to both police-reported data and victim survey data, overall crime rates have historically been higher in the west than they are in the east or in Ontario and Quebec, which may result in Westerners having more contact with police. The one exception to this trend is Nova Scotia, which has been experiencing a rising police-reported violent crime rate in recent years and which reported the second highest violent victimization rate in the 2004 GSS. It remains to be seen how these changes will influence perceptions in Atlantic Canada, particularly Nova Scotia, in the coming years.

Victims are less likely to have positive attitudes toward the police

Victims of violence are the most likely to be dissatisfied with the job of the police. While overall, victims were less likely than non-victims to view the police as doing a good job, this was especially true among victims of violence. The largest difference in levels of satisfaction was found in the rating of police enforcing the law. Specifically, 63% of non-victims rated the police as doing a good job in this area, compared to 52% of non-violent victims of crime and 44% of victims who had experienced a violent crime. Also it was found that the number of victimizations also influences public perception. Differences found in attitudes towards the police between victims and non-victims were not as evident concerning the other sectors of the justice system.

B3.2 Public satisfaction with personal safety, victims versus non-victims⁷²

Vast majority of Canadians feel satisfied with their personal safety

The public is increasingly more satisfied with its overall level of personal safety. In 2004, 94% of Canadians reported that they were either somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with their personal safety, an increase from 91% in 1999 and 86% in 1993.

Levels of satisfaction differ, however, among different segments of the population. One's sex, age, victimization experience and area of residence all influence a person's perception of their level of safety. For example, despite having the highest rates of criminal victimization, those aged 15 to 24 reported the highest levels of safety (96%) compared to their older counterparts. Concerning men and women, relatively equal proportions expressed feeling satisfied with their personal safety (95% and 93%, respectively). Compared to men, however, fewer women indicated feeling very satisfied with their personal safety. Since 1999, the proportion of women feeling safe has increased five percentage points and has risen two percentage points among men.

Not surprisingly, those who have been the victim of a crime are also less likely to be satisfied with their personal safety. This is especially true among those who have been recently victimized and those who have experienced multiple victimizations. According to the 2004 GSS, 96% of non-victims and 95% of those who said that they experienced a crime earlier than the 12 months prior to the survey were either somewhat or very satisfied with their personal safety. This figure decreased to 91% for those who had been victimized in the past 12 months.

Similarly, those who had experienced three or more crimes were less likely to state that they were very or somewhat satisfied with their personal safety (84%) than those who were victimized once (93%) or twice (89%).

Residents of Atlantic Canada are most satisfied with their personal safety

More than nine in ten residents in every province in Canada felt satisfied with their personal safety, with rates ranging from 95% to 99% in Atlantic Canada and from 93% to 94% in western Canada. In both Ontario and Quebec, 94% of residents were satisfied with their personal safety. In the Atlantic provinces, however, the majority of residents stated they were “very satisfied” with their personal safety whereas in other provinces, residents were more evenly divided between feeling “somewhat” and “very” satisfied. Residents of Quebec were the only ones who were more likely to be “somewhat” satisfied (66%) than “very” satisfied (27%) with their personal safety.

B3.3 Public fear of crime, victims versus non-victims⁷³

Three separate measures are used in the GSS to assess the level of fear of crime among the Canadian population. These measures include using public transportation alone at night, walking alone in their neighborhood after dark, and being home alone in the evening or at night. In each of these three situations, Canadians’ level of worry decreased from 1993 to 2004. In other words, Canadians in 2004 were generally less worried about becoming the victim of a crime than they were in 1999 and 1993 (Table B3.4).

Similar to overall satisfaction with personal safety, certain segments of the population are more worried about crime than others. Specifically, women are two to three times more worried than men about using public transportation alone after dark (64% versus 29%), walking alone in their area after dark (18% versus 6%) and being home alone in the evening or at night (29% versus 12%).

Those who were victimized in the past 12 months also tended to express greater levels of worry than those who had never been the target of a crime or those who had been the target sometime prior to the last 12 months. Levels of worry were especially high concerning being home alone in the evening. Approximately 26% of those most recently victimized indicated that they were worried when home alone in the evening or at night, compared to 19% of those victimized at some other point in their lifetime and 16% of those never victimized (Table B3.5).

Levels of worry were also more pronounced among victims of violent crime. For example, 18% of victims of violent crime said that they were worried about crime when walking alone in their neighborhood after dark, compared to 13% of victims of non-violent crime. Similarly, victims of multiple victimizations also expressed high levels of worry compared to victims of one crime or non-victims. Considering walking alone after dark, 8% of non-victims said that they were worried, compared to 11% of single victims, 17% of those victimized twice and 22% of those victimized three or more times during the 12-month period.

B3.4 Processing crime through the justice system

The extent to which criminal cases are resolved and the amount of time taken to process them through the court system can influence the public’s confidence in the administration of the system. A criminal justice system that is seen to operate in a reasonable period of time is regarded as an effective system.

Similarly, the extent to which police can clear, or solve, a case by laying a charge is an important measure of the effectiveness of the police in solving crime. If the police are seen to have the ability to clear a large number of crimes, the public will trust that the police are doing a good job in protecting citizens from further criminal

activity. In 2004, approximately one-quarter (23%) of the 2.8 million incidents reported by police were cleared by charge and a further 13% were cleared otherwise.⁷⁴ Therefore, the overall clearance rate for that year was 36%.⁷⁵

Clearance rates highest for violent crimes


Clearance rates vary depending on the type of crime. Crimes that are more visible, have direct victims and/or witnesses, and are reported in a relatively timely fashion are more likely to result in the police being able to clear the offence. For these reasons, violent crimes tend to have higher clearance rates than property crimes. In 2004, 69% of violent crimes were cleared (47% by charge and 22% otherwise) while this was true for only 20% of property crimes (12% by charge and 7% otherwise⁷⁶).

Within the broad groupings of violent and property crimes, certain offences are considered more serious by the public because of the level of violence or monetary loss involved and it is for these reasons that the public looks to the police to resolve these crimes quickly. These offences include homicide, sexual assault, assault, robbery, breaking and entering, motor vehicle theft and theft over \$5,000. Among these offences, clearance rates for 2004 were highest for homicide (74%), followed by assault (72%), sexual assault (59%) and robbery (36%). Clearance rates were lowest for motor vehicle theft (11%), breaking and entering (15%), and theft over \$5,000 (16%).

Clearance rates have remained fairly stable

Overall, police clearance rates have remained relatively stable over the last few decades (Figure B3.1) with annual clearance rates for all *Criminal Code* incidents (excluding traffic violations) ranging from 32% to 37%. However, since the early 1990s clearance rates for both property and violent crimes have decreased slightly.

Figure B3.1
Police clearance rates¹ for violent and property crime have decreased just slightly since the early 1990's




1. The clearance rate is the number of incidents cleared (i.e. solved) by police during the year divided by the number of incidents during the year.
 Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Clearance rates vary across the country

As clearance rates vary across offence types, they also vary considerably across jurisdictions. Reasons for the variation in clearance rates among police services can be size of the police service's jurisdiction, resource allocation, reporting systems (for example, call centers versus in-person reporting), and targeted interventions for crimes that are driven by police enforcement, such as prostitution and counterfeiting. Among the provinces, Saskatchewan had the highest clearance rate in 2004 (44%) followed by Newfoundland and Labrador (38%) and Alberta and Ontario (36%, each) (Figure B3.2). Clearance rates were lowest in British Columbia (22%), Prince Edward Island (24%) and Quebec (29%). Among the territories, Nunavut reported the highest clearance rate, clearing about two-thirds of its reported incidents (64%). Similar to the overall national trend, clearance rates in each of the provinces and territories were higher for violent crimes than for property offences (Figures B3.3 and B3.4).


Figure B3.2

Clearance rates¹ for total *Criminal Code* incidents (excluding traffic violations), Canada, the provinces and territories, 2004




1. The clearance rate is the number of incidents cleared (i.e. solved) by police during the year divided by the number of incidents during the year.
 Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Figure B3.3
Clearance rates¹ for violent crimes, Canada, the provinces and territories, 2004



1. The clearance rate is the number of incidents cleared (i.e. solved) by police during the year divided by the number of incidents during the year.
 Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Figure B3.4
Clearance rates¹ for property crimes, Canada, the provinces and territories, 2004



1. The clearance rate is the number of incidents cleared (i.e. solved) by police during the year divided by the number of incidents during the year.
 Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Court cases are taking longer to process

Having a case processed through the court system in a timely manner a fundamental right of the accused. It also is an indicator of the efficiency of the criminal court system and a factor in fostering public trust and confidence. However, there are a number of factors that can affect the time it takes to resolve a case in court from the first to the last appearance of the accused. Such factors include the complexity of the

case, the volume of cases being processed through the courts at a given time, the type of offence, the number and availability of witnesses and experts, and the accused failing to appear in court.


Overall, the average elapsed time of case processing in 2003/04 was 226 days in adult court and 141 days in youth court. In both adult and youth court, the average amount of time between the first and last court appearance has grown considerably over the last decade (Figure B3.5), as have the number of appearances per case⁷⁷ and the proportion of cases involving multiple charges, all of which suggest courts are dealing with more complex cases.

In adult court, the mean elapsed time increased from about four and a half months in 1994/95 to over seven and a half months in 2003/04 (Figure B3.5). Between these two periods the average number of appearances per case also grew from four to six, with each appearance adding approximately 30 days to the average elapsed time of a court case. Further, the proportion of cases involving multiple charges has been steadily on the rise. In 2003/04, just over half of all cases (51%) involved multiple charges, compared to 44% ten years ago.

Although the average processing time for youth courts has fluctuated annually, the average for 2003/04 (141 days) was the longest ever recorded since data became available in 1991/92 (Figure B3.5). The jump in 2003/04 may be a result of increased handling of less serious cases by the police or Crown through extrajudicial measures afforded by the *Youth Criminal Justice Act*, leaving the courts with the most complex cases. Growth in the proportion of multiple charge cases suggests increased case complexity: in 1991/92, 42% of the youth court caseload consisted of multiple charge cases, a proportion which grew steadily until accounting for 56% of the caseload in 2003/04.

Figure B3.5

The average elapsed time for case processing in youth court and adult criminal court has grown



1. Data are available from the Adult Criminal Court Survey from 1994/95 at approximately 80% of national adult criminal court caseload. This figure represents the longest trend analysis possible for jurisdictions consistently reporting to the survey during this period (i.e., Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Yukon).

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Court Survey and Adult Criminal Court Survey.


Case processing time varies by type of offence and jurisdiction

In adult and youth court, cases involving crimes against the person take longer to process than property crimes or offences against the administration of justice. For example, in 2003/04, adult court cases of offences against the person averaged 148 days, compared to 96 days for property offences and 43 days for offences against the administration of justice. Similarly, in youth court that year, offences against the person averaged about 167 days to process, compared to 149 for property offences and 98 days for cases involving offences against the administration of justice.

Among comparable jurisdictions reporting to the Adult Criminal Court Survey, mean elapsed times were longest in Ontario (214) and Nova Scotia (213 days).⁷⁸ Prince Edward Island had the shortest case processing time where cases averaged 44 days (Figure B3.6). Concerning youth court, Nova Scotia had the longest mean elapsed time at 175 days, followed by Manitoba (166 days) and Alberta (159 days) (Figure B3.7). Youth courts in the Northwest Territories had the shortest mean elapsed processing time (52 days).


Figure B3.6

Average elapsed time for case processing in adult court, by reporting jurisdictions, 2003/04



1. As information from Quebec’s municipal courts is not yet reported to the survey, the average case processing time for this jurisdiction is higher and is not comparable with the other jurisdictions. Municipal courts account for about one-quarter of *Criminal Code* charges in that province and generally process the less serious, summary offences which are the least lengthy to process.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.

Figure B3.7**Average elapsed time for case processing in youth court, Canada, provinces and territories, 2003/04**

Note: The mean represents the average value of all the data in the set. Caution should be used in making comparisons between the provinces and territories, as many factors can affect the elapsed time of a case. For instance, the use of pre-charge screening, the number of trial versus non-trial cases, complexity of cases, the seriousness of offences being prosecuted, issues related to the co-ordination and availability of various participants within the criminal justice process, lawyers' decisions on the most appropriate course of action for their clients, and accused failing to appear in courts may have an impact on the average elapsed time of cases.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Court Survey.

Counts of adult custodial remand are increasing

According to the *Criminal Code*, remand, or pre-trial detention, is imposed by the courts either to ensure that the accused appears in court or for the protection and safety of the community. Society's confidence in the administration of justice can be promoted through the use of remand in appropriate cases. On an average day in 2002/03, there were 19,374⁷⁹ adults held in provincial/territorial custody, of which approximately 45% were on remand and 53% were sentenced.⁸⁰

Since the mid-1980s, there has been an increase in the use of adult custodial remand. In fact, since that period, the average daily counts have more than doubled (3,424 in 1985/86 to 8,677 in 2002/03). As previously indicated in section A4 of this report, *Workload of the Correctional System*, factors explaining the increase in remand could include changes in laws or its interpretation, increased levels of violent offenders compared to non-violent offenders, longer court processing times, the use of "time served" sentences and increases in the duration of remand (Johnson, 2003).

B4 Goal 4: Social equity and access to the criminal justice system for all citizens

Equality before and under the law and the equal right to protection and benefit of the law are fundamental rights guaranteed under the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. However, there are a number of factors that can affect social equity within and access to the justice system. For instance, limited financial resources can affect an individual's level of legal representation in the justice system. Further, one's experience with or perception of the criminal justice system can vary depending on a number of socio-demographic characteristics such as culture and ethnicity, age, language spoken, disability and sex.

The following are measures that can be used to gauge the performance of the justice system in ensuring social equity and equal access: the number of applications for legal aid; the perceptions of visible minorities and Aboriginal people regarding various criminal justice sectors; citizens' perceptions of discrimination by the police or courts on the basis of sex, ethnicity, race, religion, sexual orientation, age or disability; and, patterns of reporting to the police by women, men, visible minorities and Aboriginal peoples.

B4.1 Number of applications for legal aid⁸¹

Not all Canadians have the financial resources to pay for a lawyer. As such, legal aid programs have been established in all provinces and territories to assist low-income Canadians to retain professional legal counsel. Services are not necessarily free, but guidelines are used to assess the applicant's ability to afford legal counsel and they may be asked to contribute to the cost or repay fees incurred.

In most jurisdictions, legal aid coverage is available for those charged with indictable offences. Usually, coverage for summary conviction cases is restricted to those where there is a likelihood of imprisonment or a danger of loss of livelihood (Kelly, 2005). Civil cases are eligible for legal aid everywhere in Canada, although the types of services and coverage vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. For instance, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and New Brunswick cover only family matters. Finally, legal aid programs in several jurisdictions are involved in specialized services that address the needs of low-income people as a whole (e.g. information, advocacy and education programs and legal research services).

Number of applications for legal aid is declining slightly


While the number of applications received by provinces and territories can be seen as a measure of the need for services, the fact that applicants are screened prior to applications being filed means the number of applications does not necessarily reflect the demand for service. Changes in coverage and eligibility criteria can affect the number of applications over time. In 2003/04, 773,254 applications for legal aid were submitted in Canada (Figure B4.1), according to the Legal Aid Survey. This represents a 5% decrease from the previous year. After peaking at about 1.2 million in 1992/93, applications for legal aid services decreased steadily, falling to 801,904 in 1997/98. Factors such as changes in pre-screening procedures, changes in legal aid

coverage, stricter eligibility criteria may have contributed to this decrease. Following these decreases, the number of applications rose for four years straight until declining in 2002/03 and again, to a new low, in 2003/04.

The 471,462 approved applications⁸² in 2003/04 represent a 5% decrease from the previous year and mark the third consecutive yearly decline (Figure B4.1). Since peaking in 1992/93, the trend for approved applications has followed that of total applications, declining steadily until 1997/98 and then rising slightly for three years.

In 2003/04, refused applications totaled 108,004 and were down 2% from 2002/03, reaching its lowest level in the last ten years. Since peaking in 1992/93 at 164,881, the number of refused applications has fluctuated from one year to the next, but generally has been down (Figure B4.1).

Figure B4.1
Number of legal aid applications is declining slightly¹



1. The sum of approved and refused applications may not equal the total applications count for two reasons: (i) A decision to accept or reject an application may not occur in the time period the application is made. Typically most applications are filed and assessed within the same time period so the number carried into the next fiscal year is comparatively small. (ii) The approved application counts refer to full service applications only, whereas the total application count is the sum of applications for service, including full and summary service, and applications refused.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Legal Aid Survey.

Legal aid applications within the provinces and territories

In 2003/04, declines in applications for legal aid were reported by British Columbia (-21%), Manitoba (-10%) and Ontario (-6%). In British Columbia, the decline was due to a drop in the number of applications for civil matters, which was fuelled in large part by the elimination of legal representation for other, non-family civil matters (e.g. landlord-tenant disputes, worker's compensation claims, Canada Pension Plan issues, etc.). Manitoba also saw a reduction in the scope of civil coverage, which accounts for some of their decline. The Yukon Territory (+17%) reported the greatest increase in the number of applications for legal aid that year.

Most jurisdictions reported decreases in approved applications in 2003/04, with the largest declines reported in New Brunswick (-15%), Prince Edward Island (-14%) and Ontario (-12%). Yukon Territory reported the most substantial increase (13%) in the number of applications approved.

With respect to the number of refused legal aid applications, a 10% decline in Ontario partially accounts for the overall decrease since 2002/03. The number refused also dropped in Nunavut (-35%), Northwest Territories (-11%) and British Columbia (-5%). The declines in refused applications for Ontario and British Columbia are consistent with the decline in total applications for these provinces.

Social equity and access among various populations

Canada is becoming increasingly ethno-culturally diverse. According to the 2001 Census of Population, Canada's foreign-born population is the highest it has been in 70 years, with 18% of the population born outside of Canada (Statistics Canada, 2003a). Beginning in the 1960s, countries of origin began to shift from Europe and the United States to Asian, South American and Central American nations. According to the 2001 Census, 58% of those who immigrated during the 1990s were from Asian and Middle Eastern countries. As a result of increased immigration from non-European countries, the 2001 Census found that 13% of Canada's population identified themselves as a visible minority. Between 1991 and 2001, the visible minority population grew six times faster than the total population and projections indicate that visible minorities will likely account for between 19% and 23% of Canada's population by 2017 (Statistics Canada, 2003b). Issues of access to justice by ethno-culturally diverse populations have been a concern for policy makers for some time (Currie, 1994).

Canada's Aboriginal population is also growing. According to the 2001 Census, over 976,000 people, or 3% of the population, identified themselves as Aboriginal, a 22% increase from 1996 (Statistics Canada, 2003c).⁸³ The involvement of Aboriginal people in the criminal justice system has been the focus of a number of reports, public inquiries and commissions and remains a public policy issue (Kong and Beattie, 2005).

While it is not possible to make conclusive statements regarding equality or equity within the criminal justice system, perceptions of discrimination and the extent to which certain populations initiate contact with the justice system can be used as indicators of how well the system is promoting social equity and equal access.

B4.2 Perceptions of police, criminal courts, prison system, and parole system by Aboriginal people and visible minorities

Aboriginal people and visible minorities⁸⁴ were more critical of police than the non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population

According to results of the 2004 General Social Survey on Victimization, Aboriginal people and visible minority populations were generally satisfied with the job performed by their local police, but were more critical than the non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population (Table B4.1). For instance, while 48% of Aboriginal people and 55% of visible minorities felt the police were doing a good job at enforcing the laws, the same was stated by 60% of other Canadians.⁸⁵ Over six in ten Aboriginal people felt the police were doing a good job at being approachable, as was the opinion of over half of visible minorities. This sentiment, however, was reported by more than two-thirds of Canadians who were neither Aboriginal nor of a visible minority background. Compared to the other two groups, Aboriginal people were more critical of police performance regarding responding to calls. Eighteen percent of Aboriginal people felt the police were doing a poor job at responding promptly to calls, compared to 7% of visible minorities and 8% of other Canadians. With respect to perceptions on how the police rate at treating people fairly, responses were very similar among Aboriginal people and visible minorities. While almost half (49%) among these two groups,

respectively, felt that the police were doing a good job at treating people fairly, the same sentiment was reported by 61% of the non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population.

Perceptions of police have not changed much since 1999. The one significant difference among Aboriginal people is that perceptions have waned with respect to how well the police are doing at supplying information on reducing crime. The proportion of Aboriginal people who felt the police were doing an average job at supplying information on reducing crime has decreased from 31% in 1999 to 23% in 2004, while the proportion who feel they are doing a poor job at this has grown from 14% to 22%. Among visible minorities, there has been a significant increase in the proportion who feel that the police are doing a good job at responding to calls (49% in 2004 compared to 41% in 1999) and this is largely due to a reduction in the proportion who were unsure how to answer the question in 1999 (24% versus 30%).

Opinions of the courts have improved among visible minorities

Overall, all populations were more critical of the courts than they were of the police, although it is important to note that relatively higher proportions of visible minorities were unsure how to rate the courts. Further, among all populations, the likelihood of rating the courts as doing a good job of ensuring a fair trial for the accused was considerably higher than rating them as good at determining the guilt of the accused, helping the victim or providing justice quickly (Table B4.1). Compared to the Aboriginal population, visible minorities and the non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population had higher opinions of the courts with respect to how well they do at determining the guilt of the accused. In terms of helping victims and providing justice quickly, visible minorities viewed the courts more positively than did Aboriginal people or non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority populations who were both quite critical of court performance in these two areas.

While opinions of the courts have not changed among Aboriginal people since 1999, views have improved among visible minorities. In 2004, a higher proportion of visible minorities felt the courts were doing a good job at ensuring a fair trial for the accused (40% versus 34% in 1999), and increases were also seen in the proportion who felt they were doing a good job at determining the guilt of the accused (27% versus 22% in 1999) and helping the victim (29% versus 22% in 1999). These changes are fuelled largely by decreases in the proportion who rated the courts as doing a poor job in these areas and decreases in the proportion who were unsure how to rate the courts.

Aboriginal people and the non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population were more critical of the prison and parole systems than visible minorities⁸⁶

Among all three groups, individuals were more likely to rate the prisons as doing either a good or average job than to rate them as doing a poor job. However, compared to visible minorities, Aboriginal people and the non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population were more likely to rate the prisons as doing a poor job at supervising/controlling prisoner and at helping prisoners become law-abiding citizens (Table B4.1).

Since 1999, there have not been significant changes in the opinions of Aboriginal people with respect to the prison system, but perceptions among visible minorities with respect to the system's ability to help prisoners become law-abiding citizens improved. The proportion of visible minorities who felt the prison system was doing a good job at this grew four percentage points in 2004, as did the proportion who felt they were doing an average job. These changes were fuelled by decreases in the proportion who felt they were doing a poor job (14% from 18%) and who were unsure of how to respond (34% from 38%).

With respect to the performance of the parole system, all three groups held much less favourable views than those expressed for the other sectors of the criminal justice system. All three groups were equally likely to rate the parole system as doing a good job at releasing offenders who are not likely to re-offend (17%, each). However, visible minorities (24%) were less likely than Aboriginal people (33%) or the non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population (32%) to rate the system as doing a poor job in this area. In contrast, visible minorities were more likely than the non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population to rate the parole system as doing a good job at supervising offenders on parole (19% versus 14%).⁸⁷

In 2004, visible minorities viewed the performance of the prison and parole systems more positively than in 1999. The proportion of visible minorities who rated the two systems as doing a good job increased between three to four percentage points in each area of performance. Changes were driven by decreases in the proportion who had rated the systems as poor in 1999 or who were unsure how to respond to the questions.

B4.3 Experience of discrimination by police or courts on the basis of sex, ethnicity, race, religion, sexual orientation, age, or disability⁸⁸

One percent of Canadians aged 15 and older reported that they had experienced ethno-culturally-based discrimination or unfair treatment when dealing with the police and courts

The Ethnic Diversity Survey⁸⁹ (EDS) examines Canada's ethno-cultural mosaic by providing information on the various ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the country's population. Among other things, EDS questioned respondents about their experiences with discrimination and unfair treatment based on their ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour, language, accent and/or religion.

According to EDS, in 2002, about one in ten Canadians aged 15 years and older felt that they had experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in the past five years in Canada based on their ethno-cultural background (Statistics Canada, 2003d). Just over half of those who perceived discrimination or unfair treatment within the past five years said that they had had these experiences often or sometimes, while just under half felt they had such experiences only rarely.

The EDS also asked respondents who reported discrimination or unfair treatment due to their ethno-cultural background about the situations in which these experiences had occurred, including interactions with Canadian police and courts.⁹⁰ In 2002, 273,000 people, or 1% of Canadians aged 15 and older,⁹¹ reported experiencing ethno-culturally based discrimination or unfair treatment when dealing with the police and courts in Canada. Examined another way, of the 1.6 million Canadians who reported experiencing discrimination either sometimes or often, 12% felt that they had experienced discrimination or had been treated unfairly by the police or courts during the past five years.

In 2002, compared to non-visible minority Canadians, a higher proportion of visible minority Canadians reported discrimination or unfair treatment in Canada in the previous five years because of their ethno-cultural characteristics (36% versus 10%). Similarly, among those who felt they had sometimes or often experienced discrimination, the proportion of visible minorities who felt they had been discriminated against or treated unfairly by the police and courts was double that of non-visible minorities (17% versus 8%).

B4.4 Reporting to the police, by sex of the victim

The extent to which certain populations contact the police and their reasons for reporting and not reporting can be used as an indirect measure of their trust in police. There are a number of factors that can influence whether or not an individual reports to the police. In addition to the factors such as the type of crime, the severity of the crime, the victim-offender relationship, the location of the incident, various socio-demographic characteristics, such as sex, visible minority status and Aboriginal status may also play a role in reporting rates (Trainor, 2000).

The General Social Survey on Victimization shows that reporting to police varies by sex of the victim. According to the 2004 GSS, 38% of violent incidents (non-spousal) experienced by men during the 12 months prior to the survey were reported to the police, with 23% reported by the victim himself and 15% by someone else. For non-spousal violent incidents involving female victims, 26% were reported to police with 17% reported by the victim herself and 9%⁹² reported by someone else.

The lower overall rate of reporting to police among women is not surprising given the higher number of female sexual assault victims and the low reporting rate for this crime. According to the 2004 General Social Survey, 83% of victims of sexual assault were female, and, overall, 88% of sexual assaults went unreported.

Although men are more likely to report non-spousal violence to the police overall, women are just as likely as men to report the incident themselves when the incident involved certain circumstances. For instance, when the violent incident resulted in injury, women were just as likely as men to report the incident to police (23%⁹³ versus 22%). Further, there was no statistical difference in reporting to the police when there was a weapon present during the incident (43% for women versus 26% for men). There was also no statistically significant difference in reporting by women (16%) and men (21%) in incidents of non-spousal violence where the aggressor was known to the victim. However, where the aggressor was a stranger, men were more likely to report the incident themselves to the police (29% of incidents versus 16%⁹⁴).

With respect to spousal violence, however, female victims are more likely to report to the police than male victims. According to the 2004 GSS, 36% of incidents that occurred during the five years prior to the survey and that involved female victims were reported to the police, with 27% reported by the victim herself and 9% reported by someone else. For males, 17% were brought to the attention of police with just 9% reported by the victim himself and 8% reported by someone else. This difference may be because women were more likely than men to report experiencing more serious forms of violence that resulted in injury, and repeated violence. The difference in reporting by men and women may also suggest a reluctance by men to involve the authorities.

Reporting by victims of spousal violence has remained virtually unchanged from 1999 when 29% of female victims contacted police themselves, as did 9% of male victims. It is difficult to determine if reporting by female victims of spousal assault has grown since 1993 when the Violence Against Women Survey was conducted. From that survey, it is known that 29% of wife assault incidents were reported to police in the five years preceding the survey (Pottie-Bunge, 2000), but it is unknown what proportion was reported by the victim herself as opposed to by someone else.⁹⁵ It is known, however, that reporting of wife assault incidents to the police overall has increased from 29% in 1993 to 36% in 2004. This increase in overall reporting may be a result of education campaigns condemning wife assault and efforts by police and Crown prosecutors to improve responses to spousal violence.

B4.5 Reporting to police by Aboriginal people and visible minorities

Victimizations involving visible minorities were just as likely to be reported to the police as incidents involving non-visible minorities. According to the 2004 General Social Survey, reporting to police was roughly the same for incidents where the victim was Aboriginal (35%), a visible minority (30%) and of a non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority background (34%). Compared to the 1999 GSS, there has been no statistically significant change in reporting rates among Aboriginal people or visible minorities, but the rate has decreased from 37% among the non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population. The most frequently cited main reason for not reporting to the police was the same for all three groups: the incident was not important enough.

Visible minorities were less likely than the non-Aboriginal/non visible minority population to be satisfied with the action taken by police (54% versus 66%). In 61% of incidents involving Aboriginal victims, the victim was satisfied with the action taken by police. However, this result is does not represent a statistically significant difference from the results for the other two groups. Further, Aboriginals and visible minorities gave the same reasons for not reporting to the police: the incident was either dealt with in another way or was not important enough to the respondent to report.

B5 Goal 5: Victim needs served

Over the years, a number of reports have assessed the needs of victims of crime (Canadian Federal-Provincial Task Force on Justice for Victims of Crime, 1983; Government of Canada, 1998; Young, 2001). The last three decades have seen a number of changes to legislation, policies and procedures to help meet these needs and to enhance service delivery, some of which go beyond the criminal justice system and touch related systems for victims of crime, such as community and social services. In general terms, the needs of victims in relation to the criminal justice system can be summarized as the need for physical security, for inclusion in the criminal justice process and for reparation of harm done. There are a number of indicators that can assess the achievement of these goals, with general indicators being the overall number of services available to victims of crime, the types of services offered and the involvement of victims in the criminal justice process. Other indicators that can be used to assess the extent to which the needs of victims are met include the use of restraining orders for offenders; the number people turned away by shelters; the number of restorative justice programs; the number of sentences involving restitution and compensation; and, the activities of provincial criminal injuries compensation programs.


B5.1 Number of services for victims of crime

The spectrum of services to victims of crime can be wide and include a variety of criminal justice sectors, health care services, social services and private practitioners. In 2003, the Victim Services Survey attempted to measure the number of victim services in Canada that are funded by ministries responsible for criminal justice matters and to collect information that would provide a profile of service agencies and people assisted.

The 2002/03 Victim Services Survey estimated that there were 597 victim service agencies in Canada in the year ending March 31, 2003 (Figure B5.1). In addition, nine provinces had financial benefit schemes to compensate victims and their families. In conducting the survey, it was found that an additional 59 services that existed during that year had closed. Forty of the fifty-nine closures were court-based victim/witness services in British Columbia.

The largest portion of the 606 victim services were the 246 police-based agencies (41%), followed by 116 community-based agencies (19%), 105 sexual assault centres (17%), 63 court-based agencies (10%), 46 system-based agencies⁹⁶ (8%) and 21 other types of agencies, such as hospital-based domestic violence and sexual assault treatment programs and agencies that provide a combination of types of services (Kong, 2004). The remaining 1% comprised the nine criminal injuries compensation programs that exist in each province, except Newfoundland and Labrador. As the 2002/03 Victim Services Survey is the first attempt to measure victim services in Canada, trend information is not available.


Figure B5.1
Number of victim service agencies, by province and territory, 2002/03



Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Victim Services Survey.

According to the 2003/04 Transition Home Survey, there were 543 shelters in Canada that provided services for abused women and their children (Figure B5.2). Transition homes accounted for about half (53%) of shelter facilities. The remaining types of shelters comprised 84 second stage housing facilities (18%), 54 emergency shelters (11%), 41 women’s emergency shelters (9%), 11 safe home networks (2%), 11 family resource centres (2%) and 22 other types of facilities (5%).⁹⁷


Figure B5.2
Number of shelters, by province and territory, 2003/04



Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Transition Home Survey.

While the actual number of facilities has increased over the years (Figure B5.3), much of this growth is due to existing shelters providing more than one type of residential service and is not a result of the creation of brand new facilities. As a result, growth in the number of facilities has not necessarily resulted in an increase in spaces for abused women. Of the 14 new shelters that reported to the 2003/04 survey, 79% (11) were affiliated with or housed in already existing shelters. Seven shelters that participated in the 2001/02 cycle of the Transition Home Survey had closed by 2003/04.⁹⁸

Figure B5.3
Number of residential services for abused women growing slowly



1. This biennial survey was not conducted in 1997 due to survey redevelopment.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Transition Home Survey.

Among the various types of shelters, transition homes primarily serve women fleeing spousal abuse, but trend data indicate that they account for fewer and fewer shelters because of growth in emergency shelters. Over half of new facilities reporting to the Transition Home Survey in 2003/04 were emergency shelters and women's emergency shelters. According to trend data, transition homes as a proportion of all shelters decreased from 67% in 1997/98 to 62% in 2003/04. During the same time period, the proportion of emergency shelters and women's emergency shelters has been growing. These emergency-type facilities accounted for 11% of all shelters in 1997/98, and 17% by 2003/04.

B5.2 Types of services offered by victim service agencies and shelters

Victim service agencies and shelters offer a variety of services to help keep victims safe, to help victims through the criminal justice process and facilitate their involvement in it, and to help repair the harm suffered by victims (Tables B5.1 and B5.2).

In terms of providing for the safety of victims, most agencies respond to the victim's immediate safety needs. Table B5.1 shows that the majority of all types of victim service agencies provide immediate safety planning for victims. However, few agencies conduct or coordinate risk assessments which are key to preventing re-victimization. Long-term safety planning is offered mainly by system-based agencies, sexual assault centres and community-based agencies. Training victims to prevent

victimization is offered mainly by sexual assault centres. For shelters, their *raison d'être* is to provide a safe place of refuge for people in need and 84% of shelters provide housing referrals to residents, a measure to help find safe housing (Table B5.2). In addition, shelters offer services that, indirectly, will help to promote the safety of victims of abuse by reducing their vulnerability and increasing their independence. These services include help to secure financial assistance or welfare, provision of life skills training, provision of job training and help with employment searches.

In general, most types of agencies offer services to promote the victims' involvement in the criminal justice system through services such as providing information on the criminal justice process and structure, providing court information and providing assistance with victim impact statements (Table B5.1).

In terms of services that can be categorized as service to help repair the harm done to the victim, these are predominantly provided by sexual assault centres and shelters. In terms of counseling, most victim service agencies provide only immediate assistance to victims through crisis intervention or critical stress debriefing and referrals are provided for other types of counseling. Sexual assault centres and shelters, however, are more likely to provide different types of counseling and have crisis lines (Tables B5.1 and B5.2). In addition, few agencies offer assistance regarding the non-traditional justice processes of restorative justice and mediation (Table B5.1). Overall, four in ten agencies offer assistance with financial claims (Table B5.1).

B5.3 Police response to victims

Often, the police are a victim's first contact with the criminal justice system, making the police their first source for assistance in the form of protection and information. In 2002/03, 41% of victim service agencies funded in whole or in part by ministries responsible for justice matters were police-based. In other instances, police work closely with victim service agencies by referring victims to appropriate services.

Majority of victims continue to be satisfied with police responses

The General Social Survey (GSS) on Victimization asks about the actions police took in response to an incident of victimization, information which can be used to assess police responses to the types of crimes measured by this survey. According to the GSS, in 64% of incidents that were reported to police, victims were satisfied with police responses and in 32%, victims indicated feelings of dissatisfaction.⁹⁹ These overall levels have not changed significantly from 1999. More precisely, in 60% of violent incidents, the victim was satisfied with police responses and the same was true for 66% of non-violent incidents. In both 1999 and 2004, however, incidents of violent crime were more likely than incidents of non-violent crime to end in the victim feeling very satisfied with police responses. For example, in 2004, in 36% of violent crime incidents reported to police, the victim was very satisfied with police responses, compared to 27% in non-violent crimes.

The only significant change in victims' perceptions of police responses since 1999 is that victims of non-violent crime were less apt in 2004 to state being very satisfied with the police response (27% versus 33% in 1999) and were more likely to state feeling somewhat satisfied (39% versus 33% in 1999).

B5.4 Involvement of victims in the court process

Traditionally, victims were considered simply witnesses in the court process and the process itself was often a traumatizing one (Canadian Federal-Provincial Task Force on Justice for Victims of Crime, 1983; Young, 2001). Within the last two decades, government has responded by implementing a number of legislative changes to prevent

the “re-victimization” of victims during court proceedings by establishing new procedural and evidentiary rules intended to facilitate the provision of testimony during court proceedings for sexual offences and other specified offences.¹⁰⁰ Examples of these include provisions to protect the victim’s private and confidential records from use in court and, under certain circumstances, permitting victims under the age of 18 to provide testimony from behind a screen or by closed-circuit television (Kong, 2004). Presently, there are no national data to measure the extent to which these initiatives are used.

Victim impact statements represent a key initiative in affording victims a voice in the courtroom. This type of statement describes the harm done to or the loss suffered by the victim. The notion of a victim impact statement was originally introduced to Canada’s justice system in 1988 and has continued to evolve over the years. As of 1999, judges are required to inquire whether or not the victim has been informed of their right to complete a victim impact statement and, where the victim has not been informed, the judge can adjourn proceedings to allow time to prepare one. While the victim may choose not to submit a statement, the goal of this provision is to ensure that the victim is aware of their right under the *Criminal Code*.

There are no national data to assess the extent to which victim impact statements are submitted in court. Limited research to date suggests that few statements are submitted to the courts (Roberts, 1992; Roberts and Edgar, 2002). For instance, based on a 2002 survey of about one-third of sentencing judges in Ontario, it was found that victim impact statements were submitted in about 11% of cases that ended in a sentence being imposed. Specifically, 70% of the sample of judges reported that a victim impact statement had been submitted in less than 10% of cases in which they had imposed a sentence. However, judges reported seeing an increase in the number of victim impact statements submitted since the 1999 amendments: 37% reported a slight increase, 25% reported a moderate increase and 8% reported a significant increase. Almost one-third (30%) reported no change since the 1999 amendments.

To fill the gap in information regarding the use of victim impact statements, the 2002/03 Victim Services Survey attempted to collect a count of the number of victim impact statements with which victim service agencies assisted victims during the fiscal year 2002/03 and the number filed with the courts. Overall, many agencies were unable to provide this information. Specifically, 15% of agencies indicated that this type of work was not within their mandate or role and 3% did not answer the question (Kong, 2004). Among the remaining 399 agencies, just over half (51%) did not track this information. The 187 agencies that did track this information reported assisting clients with approximately 15,500 victim impact statements that year. Regarding the number of statements filed with the courts, even fewer agencies tracked this information. Counting only those agencies for whom this type of work was applicable and those who responded to the question, 65% reported that they did not track this information.

B5.5 Involvement of victims in the corrections and conditional release process

Improving the rights of victims has also extended into the correctional and conditional release systems. As with other sectors of the justice system, victims have voiced a need for more information regarding decisions and activities of the criminal justice system in relation to the offender who harmed them, and more opportunities to be heard. These concerns have an impact on federal and provincial correctional agencies, the National Parole Board and the provincial parole boards of Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia.

The *Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA)*, which governs Correctional Services of Canada and the National Parole Board, formally recognizes the important role of victims in the correctional process. Correctional Services Canada (CSC) is responsible for the supervision of offenders serving custodial sentences of two years or more and the National Parole Board (NPB) has the authority to grant, deny and revoke the parole and conditional or temporary release of all offenders, including those serving a sentence of less than two years. The NPB has jurisdiction in all provinces except Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia which have their own provincial parole boards.


The National Parole Board monitors trends in activities relating to victim rights under the *CCRA*. According to these data, contacts with victims for the purpose of providing information increased 7% in 2003/04 and represent a 37% growth over the number of contacts recorded in 1999/00 (National Parole Board, 2004).¹⁰¹ With respect to observers at NPB hearings, while the number of observers declined 5% in 2003/04, the number of hearings with observers increased 7%. In July 2001, provisions were enacted permitting victims to read prepared statements aloud at NPB hearings whereas prior to that date, statements were only submitted. In 2003/04, 162 presentations were made at 110 hearings, representing an increase of 22% from the previous year. The majority of these presentations were made in person (70%) while 22% were presented via audiotape and 8% were on videotape. In general, presentations are usually comprised of cases of murder, manslaughter and sexual assault.

B5.6 Use of peace bonds and restraining orders for offenders

When a person fears for their safety or the safety of someone in their care, such as their children, they can apply for an order to seek protection from the individual they fear. Peace bonds and restraining orders are both protective orders, but there are important differences (British Columbia Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General, 2003). Peace bonds are protective orders available through section 810 of the *Criminal Code* and are initiated through the police and are processed by the criminal court by a Crown attorney. A peace bond lasts up to one year, as per the provisions of the *Criminal Code*. Restraining orders are protective orders that are obtained through the civil justice system, usually with the assistance of a lawyer, and are without a fixed time limit unless one is set as a condition by the civil judge. In some jurisdictions, application and lawyer fees may be incurred by those applying for a restraining order through civil court. Because they are issued under federal legislation, peace bonds are enforceable anywhere in Canada whereas restraining orders are issued according to provincial legislation (e.g. provincial acts governing family law). The Adult Criminal Court Survey (ACCS) and the 2004 General Social Survey (GSS) on Victimization offer some measures on the use and breach of peace bonds and restraining orders.

Number of peace bonds issued in selected jurisdictions has doubled in a decade

Trend information on the number of peace bonds issued in adult criminal courts under section 810 of the *Criminal Code* and the number of breaches are available for Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Alberta and the Yukon Territory.¹⁰² In 2003/04, these five jurisdictions reported issuing over 14,500 peace bonds, more than double the number issued in 1994/95 (Figure B5.4). While the number of peace bonds issued has been growing steadily during this ten-year period, a dramatic jump was reported in 2001/02, largely due to increases in Quebec, Ontario and Alberta. In 2003/04, the five jurisdictions reported a total of 759 breaches (Table B5.3), representing overall breach rate of 5% which has been fairly stable since 1994/95.¹⁰³

Figure B5.4**Number of peace bonds issued in selected jurisdictions has doubled in a decade¹**

1. Data are available from the Adult Criminal Court Survey from 1994/95 at approximately 80% of national adult criminal court caseload. This figure represents the longest trend analysis possible for jurisdictions consistently reporting to the survey during this period and those who tracked issuances of peace bonds pursuant to section 810 of the *Criminal Code*. Therefore, this graph represents data from Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon Territory.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.

Policy and program responses to victims of intimate partner violence and criminal harassment have specifically included peace bonds and restraining orders. For instance, in 1995, Bill C-42 was enacted to make it easier to obtain peace bonds and to increase the maximum penalty for the violation of a peace bond. Since then, the majority of provinces and territories have or will be enacting domestic violence legislation that includes provisions regarding the issuance of restraining orders, including temporary or emergency orders. To gather information on this issue, the 2004 General Social Survey (GSS) on Victimization asked victims of criminal harassment (stalking) and spousal violence about their use of protective orders.

About one in ten victims of stalking obtained a protective order¹⁰⁴

According to the 2004 GSS, of the over 2.3 million Canadians 15 years and older who had been the victim of criminal harassment during the five years prior to the survey, 11% had sought some type of protective order against their stalker (Table B5.4) (Aucoin, 2005a). Female victims were slightly more likely than male victims to have obtained protective orders (12% versus 9%). Sixty-five percent of victims who had obtained a protective order received a peace bond through a criminal court, while 20% secured a restraining order through a civil (i.e. family) court.¹⁰⁵ Just under half (45%) of the female victims who sought a restraining order did so to seek protection from current or ex-intimate partners (including spouses) who were stalking them and a further 21% were seeking protection from individuals they classified as friends. In contrast, male stalking victims mostly obtained protective orders against friends (31%), relatives other than a spouse (20%) and strangers (14%). Only 8% of male stalking victims who sought a protective order were taking such action against a current or ex-intimate partner.

For almost half of stalking victims who obtained a protective order, the order had been breached

For almost half (49%) of stalking victims who obtained a protective order, the order had been breached, meaning the stalker had come into contact with the victim despite the conditions of the order (Table B5.4). Breach rates were similar for female (49%) and male victims (48%).

Overall, more than one-third of stalking victims reported using the criminal justice system by either reporting the incident to the police or by obtaining a protective or restraining order against the aggressor. Among those who used the criminal justice system, 23% reported being very satisfied, 27% were somewhat satisfied, 17% were somewhat dissatisfied and 26% were very dissatisfied with responses by the system. These feelings of satisfaction were similar between females and males.

One-third of spousal violence victims who reported to police also had a protective order against their partner¹⁰⁶

According to the 2004 GSS, about one-third (32%) of spousal violence victims who reported the violence to the police had also sought a restraining order or protective order against their abuser (Mihorean, 2005). The majority of these orders had been obtained through criminal court (73%) as opposed to civil court (18%).¹⁰⁷ The likelihood of seeking a protective order was the same for both those who had experienced violence from a current partner (29%) and those who self-reported spousal violence from an ex-partner (33%). Female victims of spousal violence who reported to police, however, were more likely than male victims to have obtained a protective order or restraining order (38% versus 15%¹⁰⁸).

With respect to violations of the order, almost one half (48%) of spousal violence victims who had obtained a protective order indicated that it had been violated. Among those who stated that the order had been violated, almost two-thirds (66%) said they had reported the violation to the police. Among those who had reported the violation to police, 53%¹⁰⁹ indicated that the police had laid a charge against the abuser because of the violation.

B5.7 Number of clients turned away by shelters

The capacity of shelters to serve all clients is a measurement of this service's ability to meet the needs of those seeking refuge. On April 14, 2004, 93 shelters said they referred 221 women and 112 children elsewhere and 62% of these shelters had to turn people away because the shelter was full. A drug or alcohol issue was the reason for referral for 11% of shelters and for 10%, mental health issues was the reason. Other reasons included those related to non-admit/caution lists (5%) and a variety of other reasons (20%) (Taylor-Butts, 2005).¹¹⁰

Trend data show that the number of shelters that had to refer women and children elsewhere because the shelter was full increased by 10 percentage points over the two reporting periods (58% in 2000 versus 68% in 2002).

B5.8 Number of restorative justice programs

Restorative justice has the goals of restoring the loss experienced by the victim and the community, restoring relationships and repairing any harm done to the victims and the community.¹¹¹ This is achieved through voluntary participation by all parties, including members of the community, and requires the offender to recognize the harm done and to actively take part in the reparation of harm done.

Although there are currently no national estimates of the number of restorative justice programs in Canada, the 2002/03 Victim Services Survey asked agencies whether or not they were “directly involved in the coordination and/or delivery of restorative justice processes for criminal justice matters”. Of the 484 agencies that responded to the survey, 82 (17%) indicated that they were involved in the coordination and delivery of such services. Involvement was highest among police-based victim services (27%) and lowest among sexual assault centres (2%). It should be noted that some victim advocates caution that restorative justice processes may not be suitable for all types of crimes, such as violent incidents or ones characterized by an imbalance of power between the victim and the accused (e.g. cases of family violence).

B5.9 Number of sentences involving restitution


A restitution order by the courts requires the convicted offender to pay an amount directly to the victim of the offence to compensate the victim for monetary losses or damage to property that resulted from the offence. The goals of restitution are to provide reparation for harm done to the victims or the community, to promote a sense of responsibility in offenders and to help the offender acknowledge the harm done (Department of Justice Canada, no date).

Orders of restitution as a proportion of sentences remain stable in adult criminal court and are declining in youth court

According to adult court data from eight jurisdictions, restitution is ordered relatively infrequently. In 2003/04, 10,444 (4%) of the over 257,000 convicted cases resulted in an order of restitution (Figure B5.5), a proportion that has remained stable during the previous 10-year period. Not surprisingly, the vast majority of restitution orders are for property crime convictions. In 2003/04, 13% of property crime convictions resulted in restitution. Again, the proportion of property crime cases ending in restitution has been relatively stable since 1994/95.

Figure B5.5

Number of adult criminal court convictions resulting in restitution fewer than a decade ago¹




1. Adult Criminal Court Survey data are not reported by Manitoba, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut, and superior courts in Newfoundland and Labrador, Quebec, Ontario and Saskatchewan.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Adult Criminal Court Survey.

In youth court, the proportion of cases wherein the youth is given an order of restitution or some other form of compensation has been declining since 1997/98. Of the 40,184 convicted cases in 2003/04, 3,076 (6%) were given an order of restitution or compensation as part of their sentence (Figure B5.6). This proportion has been steadily declining since 1997/98 when the number of restitution and compensation orders jumped to 5,977 and were a component of the sentence for 10% of all convictions. Prior to 1997/98, these orders made up 5% to 6% of total convictions.

Figure B5.6

Number of youth court convictions resulting in an order of restitution or other types of compensation has been generally declining since 1997/98



1. Restitution is a disposition wherein the young person is ordered to return property obtained as a result of the offence pursuant to section s.42(2)(f) of the *Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA)* or, prior to April 1, 2003, pursuant to section 20(1)(d) of the *Young Offenders Act (YOA)*. In some jurisdictions, this disposition may be coded as compensation.
2. Other types of compensation include orders to make compensation in dollars or in kind (section 42(2)(e) of the *YCJA* or, prior to April 1, 2003, sections 20(1)(c) and (f) of the *YOA*), and order to make payment to innocent purchaser of stolen goods (section 42(2)(g) of the *YCJA* or, prior to April 1, 2003, section 20(1)(e) of the *YOA*).

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Court Survey.

B5.10 Compensation for victims of crime

The creation of compensation schemes for victims of crime was the first form of legislated action to address victim needs. In 1967, Saskatchewan enacted the first legislated compensation scheme. Today, all jurisdictions, except Newfoundland and Labrador and the three territories, have victim compensation schemes. The aim of compensation programs is to alleviate the financial burden victims of crime and their families can incur as a result of the incident.

Each program is established according to its respective provincial legislative authority and administered either by the ministry responsible for victim services or a compensation board. As such, the eligibility criteria and expenses and damages for which programs will compensate can vary greatly from one jurisdiction to another. In general, the programs are available to the victim of a criminal offence (usually violent crimes), and family members and dependants of persons who lost their life. Many programs are also available to persons who are injured or killed while trying to assist a police officer or while preventing or attempting to prevent a crime.

In 2003, the Victim Services Survey attempted to collect standardized data from criminal injuries compensation and financial benefit programs. Among the eight programs that responded¹¹², there was total of 10,874 applications that were adjudicated or concluded during 2002/03 and another 8,927 that were carried forward to the following fiscal year (Table B5.5). Of the total adjudicated, 7,584 (70%) were allowed or granted and 1,511 (14%) were disallowed. The remaining 1,782 (16%) had another status, such as decision pending, withdrawn or abandoned by the applicant (Table B5.6).

The eight respondents reported paying a total of \$70.7 million in compensation to victims of crime in 2002/03, with Quebec accounting for most of the funds paid (67%), followed by Ontario (20%) (Table B5.6).

Appendix B

Tables for Performance

Table B1.1
Rates of victimization and changes over time, Canada¹ and the provinces, 1999 to 2004

	Violent victimization ²		Theft of personal property		Household victimization	
	2004 rate per 1,000 population 15 years and older	Percentage change from 1999 to 2004	2004 rate per 1,000 population 15 years and older	Percentage change from 1999 to 2004	2004 rate per 1,000 households	Percentage change from 1999 to 2004
Canada	106	-5³	93	+24	248	+14
Newfoundland and Labrador	87 ^E	+6 ³	55	-8 ³	127	-9 ³
Prince Edward Island	78 ^E	-41 ³	95 ^E	+40 ³	158	+18 ³
Nova Scotia	157	+65	84	+45 ³	232	+16 ³
New Brunswick	116	+23 ³	87	+78	169	+6 ³
Quebec	59	-44	58	-17 ³	147	-28
Ontario	112	+15 ³	103	+49	233	+20
Manitoba	139	+22 ³	106	+112	403	+71
Saskatchewan	134	+8 ³	96	+50	406	+57
Alberta	160	+27 ³	97	+21 ³	331	+45
British Columbia	108	-29	127	+6 ³	376	+18

^E use with caution

1. Excludes data from the Northwest Territories, the Yukon Territory and Nunavut, which were collected as part of a pilot test.
2. Includes all incidents of spousal sexual and physical assault. Percentage change in rates from 1993 are not presented as data are not comparable.
3. Difference is not statistically significant.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 2004.

Table B2.1

Youth court cases with convictions by type of sentence¹, Canada, 2003/04

Most serious offence	Total convicted cases	Type of sentence for most serious offence									
		Custody ²		Probation		Fine		Community service		Other ³	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total offences	40,184	9,084	22.6	25,261	62.9	2,472	6.2	11,161	27.8	14,544	36.2
Crimes against the person	11,685	2,774	23.7	8,806	75.4	203	1.7	2,782	23.8	4,902	42.0
Homicide	19	11	57.9	3	15.8	0	0.0	1	5.3	10	52.6
Attempted murder	11	4	36.4	8	72.7	0	0.0	4	36.4	5	45.5
Robbery	1,362	615	45.2	1,071	78.6	10	0.7	350	25.7	814	59.8
Sexual assault	558	119	21.3	481	86.2	2	0.4	81	14.5	217	38.9
Other sexual offences	275	46	16.7	241	87.6	2	0.7	34	12.4	119	43.3
Major assault	2,662	732	27.5	2,076	78.0	57	2.1	710	26.7	1,248	46.9
Common assault	5,022	841	16.7	3,594	71.6	110	2.2	1,230	24.5	1,866	37.2
Uttering threats	1,500	335	22.3	1,120	74.7	19	1.3	294	19.6	493	32.9
Criminal harassment	110	22	20.0	88	80.0	0	0.0	25	22.7	48	43.6
Other crimes against persons	166	49	29.5	124	74.7	3	1.8	53	31.9	82	49.4
Crimes against property	14,540	2,834	19.5	9,788	67.3	641	4.4	4,707	32.4	5,202	35.8
Theft	5,234	865	16.5	3,191	61.0	346	6.6	1,673	32.0	1,901	36.3
Break and enter	4,312	1,087	25.2	3,385	78.5	52	1.2	1,499	34.8	1,433	33.2
Fraud	719	120	16.7	506	70.4	42	5.8	214	29.8	304	42.3
Mischief	1,635	105	6.4	969	59.3	92	5.6	571	34.9	798	48.8
Possess stolen property	2,410	625	25.9	1,565	64.9	100	4.1	671	27.8	684	28.4
Other property crimes	230	32	13.9	172	74.8	9	3.9	79	34.3	82	35.7
Administration of justice	3,734	1,383	37.0	1,590	42.6	269	7.2	670	17.9	891	23.9
Fail to appear	434	115	26.5	155	35.7	52	12.0	71	16.4	120	27.6
Breach of probation	83	19	22.9	44	53.0	12	14.5	13	15.7	15	18.1
Unlawfully at large	783	621	79.3	147	18.8	11	1.4	55	7.0	100	12.8
Fail to comply with order	2,123	539	25.4	1,048	49.4	183	8.6	455	21.4	592	27.9
Other administration of justice	311	89	28.6	196	63.0	11	3.5	76	24.4	64	20.6
Other Criminal Code	1,956	378	19.3	1,221	62.4	104	5.3	497	25.4	820	41.9
Weapons	696	131	18.8	454	65.2	24	3.4	167	24.0	397	57.0
Prostitution	11	4	36.4	8	72.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	36.4
Disturbing the peace	140	7	5.0	70	50.0	23	16.4	25	17.9	52	37.1
Residual <i>Criminal Code</i>	1,109	236	21.3	689	62.1	57	5.1	305	27.5	367	33.1
Total Criminal Code (excluding traffic)	31,915	7,369	23.1	21,405	67.1	1,217	3.8	8,656	27.1	11,815	37.0
Criminal Code traffic	772	64	8.3	322	41.7	381	49.4	168	21.8	585	75.8
Impaired driving	434	3	0.7	111	25.6	310	71.4	70	16.1	402	92.6
Other <i>Criminal Code</i> traffic	338	61	18.0	211	62.4	71	21.0	98	29.0	183	54.1
Total Criminal Code	32,687	7,433	22.7	21,727	66.5	1,598	4.9	8,824	27.0	12,400	37.9
Other federal statute total	7,497	1,651	22.0	3,534	47.1	874	11.7	2,337	31.2	2,144	28.6
Drug possession	767	32	4.2	343	44.7	131	17.1	266	34.7	395	51.5
Drug trafficking	894	114	12.8	726	81.2	47	5.3	397	44.4	563	63.0
<i>Youth Criminal Justice Act/ Young Offenders Act</i>	5,191	1,411	27.2	2,369	45.6	533	10.3	1,503	29.0	967	18.6
Other federal statutes	645	94	14.6	96	14.9	163	25.3	171	26.5	219	34.0

1. Sentencing data represent all sentences and not the most serious sentence in a case. Data for 2003/04 are not currently available by most serious sentence due to the transition to the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* which took effect April 1, 2003 and introduced new sentencing options.
2. S. 85(1) of the *YCJA* specifies that the provinces and territories must provide for at least two levels of custody, however the levels are not defined (as in the *YOA*, which provided for open and secure levels of custody). The majority of provinces and territories no longer maintain data in their operational systems pertaining to the level of custody to which a youth was sentenced.
3. Other sentences include reprimand, absolute discharge, restitution, prohibition, seizure, forfeiture, compensation, pay purchaser, essays, apologies, counseling programs, deferred custody and supervision, attendance at non-residential program, intensive support and supervision, and conditional discharge.

Note: The sentence types presented are not mutually exclusive and will not add to 100.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Court Survey.

Table B2.2**Convicted youth court cases by most serious sentence, Canada, provinces and territories, 2002/03¹**

	Total	Secure custody		Open custody		Total custody		Probation		Fine		Other	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Canada	50,433	7,278	14	6,534	13	13,812	27	28,774	57	2,844	6	5,003	10
Newfoundland and Labrador	1,078	282	26	140	13	422	39	584	54	30	3	42	4
Prince Edward Island	194	39	20	41	21	80	41	90	46	13	7	11	6
Nova Scotia	1,290	24	2	393	30	417	32	736	57	72	6	65	5
New Brunswick	1,466	235	16	199	14	434	30	906	62	81	6	45	3
Quebec	5,986	819	14	476	8	1,295	22	3,596	60	138	2	957	16
Ontario	21,689	3,031	14	3,154	15	6,185	29	13,975	64	619	3	910	4
Manitoba	2,468	277	11	360	15	637	26	1,252	51	191	8	388	16
Saskatchewan	4,101	873	21	457	11	1,330	32	1,920	47	189	5	662	16
Alberta	6,965	1,038	15	332	5	1,370	20	2,676	38	1,326	19	1,593	23
British Columbia	4,679	563	12	883	19	1,446	31	2,799	60	156	3	278	6
Yukon Territory	72	18	25	18	25	36	50	21	29	1	1	14	19
Northwest Territories	283	53	19	60	21	113	40	122	43	26	9	22	8
Nunavut	162	26	16	21	13	47	29	97	60	2	1	16	10

1. While sentencing data are available for 2003/04, they are currently not available by the most serious sentence due to the transition to the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* which took effect April 1, 2003 and introduced new sentencing options.

Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Court Survey.

Table B2.3**Convicted cases in youth courts by mean and median length of custody, probation and fine amounts, Canada and the provinces and territories, 2003/04**

	Length of custody and supervision order (days)			Length of probation (days)			Amount of fine (dollars)		
	Count	Mean	Median	Count	Mean	Median	Count	Mean	Median
Canada	9,084	67	33	25,261	381	360	2,472	219	150
Newfoundland and Labrador	192	73	53	596	403	365	37	100	50
Prince Edward Island	26	81	60	90	403	360	19	377	300
Nova Scotia	154	93	60	750	351	360	54	224	135
New Brunswick	263	64	40	545	345	360	43	269	200
Quebec	914	133	90	3,847	325	360	255	212	150
Ontario	4,715	51	30	12,373	424	360	545	235	200
Manitoba	356	89	60	1,060	480	450	189	329	200
Saskatchewan	854	99	60	1,490	321	360	118	242	200
Alberta	792	60	20	2,358	299	270	1,005	188	150
British Columbia	738	41	20	1,770	319	360	192	209	150
Yukon Territory	13	101	47	23	256	270	0
Northwest Territories	33	175	90	114	332	360	14	277	200
Nunavut	34	74	30	116	378	360	1	600	600

0 true zero or a value rounded to zero

... not applicable

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Youth Court Survey.

Table B3.1

Perceptions of the justice system for population aged 15 years and older, Canada, 1999 and 2004

	1999				
	Total	Good job	Average job	Poor job	Don't know/ Not stated
	Percentage of population 15 years and older				
What kind of job are your local police doing at...					
Being approachable	100	66	17	4	12
Ensuring the safety of citizens	100	62	26	5	6
Enforcing the laws	100	60	29	5	5
Supplying information on reducing crime	100	54	26	9	11
Responding promptly to calls	100	49	21	8	23
What kind of job are criminal courts doing at...					
Ensuring a fair trial for the accused	100	41	35	11	14
Determining the guilt of the accused	100	21	43	20	17
Helping the victim	100	15	33	35	16
Providing justice quickly	100	13	35	41	11
What kind of job is the prison system doing at...					
Supervising/controlling prisoners	100	26	32	20	21
Helping prisoners become law-abiding	100	14	32	28	26
What kind of job is the parole system doing at...					
Releasing offenders who are not likely to re-offend	100	15	34	32	19
Supervising offenders on parole	100	13	30	33	24
	2004				
	Total	Good job	Average job	Poor job	Don't know/ Not stated
	Percentage of population 15 years and older				
What kind of job are your local police doing at...					
Being approachable	100	65	19	5	11
Ensuring the safety of citizens	100	61	28	5	6
Enforcing the laws	100	59	31	6	4
Supplying information on reducing crime	100	50	28	11	11
Responding promptly to calls	100	52	23	8	18
What kind of job are criminal courts doing at...					
Ensuring a fair trial for the accused	100	44	35	8	13
Determining the guilt of the accused	100	27	43	15	16
Helping the victim	100	20	37	28	16
Providing justice quickly	100	15	37	36	12
What kind of job is the prison system doing at...					
Supervising/controlling prisoners	100	31	32	14	23
Helping prisoners become law-abiding	100	18	35	23	24
What kind of job is the parole system doing at...					
Releasing offenders who are not likely to re-offend	100	17	37	31	16
Supervising offenders on parole	100	15	33	32	20

Note: Figures may not add to total due to rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey on Victimization, 1999 and 2004.

Table B3.2**Perceptions of the criminal justice system doing a good job for population 15 years and older, Canada, 1988, 1993, 1999 and 2004**

	Public perceptions			
	1988	1993	1999	2004
Percentage of population 15 years and older				
Local police are doing a good job...				
Enforcing the laws	60	58	60	59
Responding promptly to calls	50	47	49	52
Being approachable	66	64	66	65
Supplying information on reducing crime	56	52	54	50
Ensuring the safety of citizens	..	58	62	61
Treating people fairly	59
Criminal courts are doing a good job...				
Providing justice quickly	14	10	13	15
Helping the victim	16	12	15	20
Determining whether or not the accused is guilty	25	20	21	27
Ensuring a fair trial for the accused	44	46	41	44
The prison system is doing a good job...				
Supervising/controlling prisoners	26	31
Helping prisoners become law abiding	14	18
The parole system is doing a good job...				
Releasing offenders who are not likely to re-offend	15	17
Supervising offenders on parole	13	15

.. not available for a reference period

1. Only the percentage who perceive justice agencies as doing a good job is shown.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 1988, 1993, 1999, 2004.

Table B3.3**Perceptions of the criminal justice system doing a good job, by province, 2004¹**

	Total provinces	Province									
		N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.
Percentage of population 15 years and older											
Local police are doing a good job...											
Enforcing the laws	59	54	58	58	60	64	60	52	49	57	54
Responding promptly to calls	52	50	61	58	58	56	52	42	42	47	47
Being approachable	65	74	75	72	74	61	66	64	67	67	65
Supplying information on reducing crime	50	56	54	54	51	53	49	49	48	53	49
Ensuring the safety of citizens	61	66	63	63	66	66	62	55	55	60	54
Treating people fairly	59	66	68	63	65	63	58	57	55	57	54
Criminal courts are doing a good job...											
Providing justice quickly	15	21	20	16	25	17	14	11	15	15	11
Helping the victim	20	24	25	21	27	21	20	17	19	19	16
Determining whether or not the accused is guilty	27	25	38	31	36	30	26	19	25	27	22
Ensuring a fair trial for the accused	44	38	54	46	49	45	44	38	43	46	43
The prison system is doing a good job...											
Supervising/controlling prisoners	31	32	36	35	39	38	29	28	27	25	26
Helping prisoners become law abiding	18	24	28	21	25	24	16	14	16	15	13
The parole system is doing a good job...											
Releasing offenders who are not likely to re-offend	17	17	24	19	22	23	14	11	16	14	13
Supervising offenders on parole	15	20	23	19	21	17	14	12	15	14	11

1. Only the percentage who perceive justice agencies as doing a good job is shown.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 2004.

Table B3.4**Feelings of safety from crime for population aged 15 years and older, 1993, 1999 and 2004**

	1993	1999	2004
	Percentage of population 15 years and older		
Total	100	100	100
In general, how do you feel about your safety from crime?			
Very satisfied	40	44	44
Somewhat satisfied	46	47	50
Somewhat dissatisfied	7	4	4
Very dissatisfied	4	2	1
Don't know/not stated	3	3	1
Total	100	100	100
How safe do you feel from crime when walking alone in your area after dark?¹			
Very safe	39	43	44
Somewhat safe	45	45	46
Reasonably unsafe	10	9	8
Very unsafe	3	2	2
Don't know/Not stated	2	0	F
Total	100	100	100
While alone in your home in the evening or at night, how do you feel about your safety from crime?²			
Not at all worried	75	80	80
Somewhat worried	20	18	18
Very worried	4	1	2
Don't know/not stated	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100
While waiting for/using public transportation alone after dark, how do you feel about your safety from crime?¹			
Not at all worried	51	54	57
Somewhat worried	36	39	38
Very worried	12	7	5
Don't know/not stated	1	F	0
Total	100	100	100

0 true zero or a value rounded to zero

F amount too unreliable to be published

1. Based on responses of people who engage in these activities.

2. Based on responses of people who are home alone in the evening or night.

Note: Figures may not add to total due to rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 1993, 1999 and 2004.

Table B3.5**Feelings of safety from crime for population aged 15 years and older, by type of victimization, 2004**

	Total		Type of victimization				
			Not victimized ³	Victimized more than 12 months before	Victimized in the previous 12 months		
					Total ⁴	Violent	Non-violent
	Thousands	Percent	Percentage of population 15 years and older				
While waiting for/using public transportation alone after dark, how do you feel about your safety from crime?¹							
Not at all worried	3,697	57	60	62	51	52	51
Worried	2,734	42	40	38	48	48	48
Don't know/Not stated	17 ^E	0 ^E	F	F	F	F	F
Total	6,447	100	100	100	100	100	100
How safe do you feel from crime when walking alone in your area after dark?¹							
Safe	17,694	90	92	91	86	81	86
Unsafe	2,024	10	8	9	14	19	14
Don't know/Not stated	14 ^E	0 ^E	F	F	F	F	F
Total	19,732	100	100	100	100	100	100
While alone in your home in the evening or at night, how do you feel about your safety from crime?²							
Not at all worried	20,596	80	83	81	74	73	74
Worried	5,096	20	16	19	26	27	26
Don't know/Not stated	36 ^E	0 ^E	0 ^E	F	F	F	F
Total	25,728	100	100	100	100	100	100
In general, how do you feel about your safety from crime?							
Satisfied	24,352	94	95	95	91	88	94
Dissatisfied	1,308	4	3	4	9	11	5
Don't know/Not stated	246	1	1	1	1 ^E	F	1 ^E
Total	25,906	99	100	100	100	100	100

^E use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

0 true zero or a value rounded to zero

1. Based on responses for people who engage in these activities.

2. This excludes people that are never home alone.

3. This refers to people who were not victimized during their lifetime.

4. Includes victims of crimes that were not classified by type.

Note: Figures may not add to total due to rounding.**Source:** Statistics Canada, General Social Survey on Victimization, 2004.

Table B4.1

**Perceptions of the justice system among Aboriginals, visible minorities and the non-Aboriginal/
non-visible minority population, 2004**

	Aboriginal ¹				
	Total	Good job	Average job	Poor job	Don't know/ Not stated
Percentage of population 15 years and older					
What kind of job are your local police doing at...					
Being approachable	100	62	22	10	7
Ensuring the safety of citizens	100	50	33	10	6 ^E
Enforcing the laws	100	48	31	17	5 ^E
Supplying information on reducing crime	100	45	23	22	10
Responding promptly to calls	100	45	23	18	14
Treating people fairly	100	49	28	15	8 ^E
What kind of job are criminal courts doing at...					
Ensuring a fair trial for the accused	100	39	34	14	13
Determining the guilt of the accused	100	21	40	23	15
Helping the victim	100	24	30	32	14
Providing justice quickly	100	17	32	40	12
What kind of job is the prison system doing at...					
Supervising/controlling prisoners	100	27	31	20	22
Helping prisoners become law-abiding	100	18	31	29	22
What kind of job is the parole system doing at...					
Releasing offenders who are not likely to re-offend	100	17	35	33	15
Supervising offenders on parole	100	15	31	37	16
	Visible minority				
	Total	Good job	Average job	Poor job	Don't know/ Not stated
Percentage of population 15 years and older					
What kind of job are your local police doing at...					
Being approachable	100	55	23	6	16
Ensuring the safety of citizens	100	58	29	5	9
Enforcing the laws	100	55	32	6	8
Supplying information on reducing crime	100	42	29	14	15
Responding promptly to calls	100	49	21	7	24
Treating people fairly	100	49	28	9	13
What kind of job are criminal courts doing at...					
Ensuring a fair trial for the accused	100	40	31	6	23
Determining the guilt of the accused	100	27	35	11	26
Helping the victim	100	29	32	16	23
Providing justice quickly	100	22	34	22	22
What kind of job is the prison system doing at...					
Supervising/controlling prisoners	100	27	27	9	38
Helping prisoners become law-abiding	100	22	29	14	34
What kind of job is the parole system doing at...					
Releasing offenders who are not likely to re-offend	100	17	32	24	27
Supervising offenders on parole	100	19	30	22	30

Table B4.1 – concluded**Perceptions of the justice system among Aboriginals, visible minorities and the non-Aboriginal/
non-visible minority population, 2004**

	Non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population ²				
	Total	Good job	Average job	Poor job	Don't know/ Not stated
Percentage of population 15 years and older					
What kind of job are your local police doing at...					
Being approachable	100	67	19	4	10
Ensuring the safety of citizens	100	63	28	5	5
Enforcing the laws	100	60	31	5	3
Supplying information on reducing crime	100	52	28	10	10
Responding promptly to calls	100	52	23	8	17
Treating people fairly	100	61	24	6	9
What kind of job are criminal courts doing at...					
Ensuring a fair trial for the accused	100	45	36	8	11
Determining the guilt of the accused	100	27	44	15	13
Helping the victim	100	18	38	29	14
Providing justice quickly	100	14	40	38	9
What kind of job is the prison system doing at...					
Supervising/controlling prisoners	100	32	33	15	21
Helping prisoners become law-abiding	100	18	37	24	22
What kind of job is the parole system doing at...					
Releasing offenders who are not likely to re-offend	100	17	38	32	14
Supervising offenders on parole	100	14	34	33	18

^E use with caution

1. "Aboriginal" includes individuals of mixed Aboriginal and other racial background.
2. "Non-Aboriginal/non-visible minority population" includes single origin White, and multiple origin White/Latin American and White/Arab-West Asian, as per the Census of population definition.

Note: Figures may not add to total due to rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey on Victimization, 2004.

Table B5.1

Percentage of victim service agencies that provide selected types of services directly¹, by type of agency, 2002/03

Types of services	Total agencies	System-based ²	Police-based	Court-based	Sexual assault centres	Community-based ³	Other ⁴
Services promoting victims' physical safety							
Immediate safety planning	85	70	85	87	85	89	90
Long-term safety planning	59	70	50	46	72	71	57
Victimization prevention training	49	39	45	38	70	56	52
Conduct or coordinate risk assessments	43	50	36	46	54	43	62
Housing assistance	11	30	4	10	8	22	5
Services promoting victims' involvement in the criminal justice system							
Information on the criminal justice system structure and process	85	100	85	96	82	77	67
Court information	85	100	92	98	75	67	57
Court accompaniment	82	98	84	98	80	70	62
Court orientation	76	100	84	94	46	63	43
Victim/witness preparation	75	100	82	94	56	58	43
Case/trial updates	73	100	85	94	38	55	43
Assistance with victim impact statements	81	100	85	92	70	71	52
Victim notification ⁶	64	100	77	65	28	44	43
Services promoting the reparation of harm done							
Emotional support	95	100	95	96	92	92	100
Crisis intervention	77	65	80	62	92	74	76
Hospital accompaniment	61	9	75	17	79	66	62
Critical stress debriefing and response	55	61	58	28	57	64	38
Crisis counseling	44	98	18	25	89	51	62
Individual counseling	27	35	5	12	85	37	48
Group counseling	20	4	2	6	82	32	33
Couple and/or family counseling	12	0	4	6	30	21	29
Self-help/peer support groups	20	0	9	2	70	29	19
Crisis or distress line	27	2	16	0	84	41	29
Psychological assistance	22	2	10	10	59	35	52
Restorative justice/mediation measures: orientation and information	22	4	37	19	7	14	10
Restorative justice/mediation measures: accompaniment and support	33	11	51	25	18	24	14
Claims assistance	41	7	53	33	43	39	19

1. In most cases, agencies that do not provide a service directly will provide it through referral to another agency.
2. Services under the system-based model assist victims throughout their contact with the criminal justice system from the police through to the corrections stage.
3. Community-based agencies include Ontario's Victim Crisis Assistance and Referral Services (VCARS) which work closely with the police but are community-based, non-government services.
4. Includes 9 sexual assault, partner or domestic violence treatment centres, 11 agencies that offered combined types of services and 1 other type of agency.
5. Totals exceed 100% due to multiple responses.
6. This is a service that provides information to victims about the status of offenders, such as dates for upcoming releases from correctional institutions and movement from one institution to another.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Victim Services Survey.

Table B5.2**Number of shelters providing in-house services¹ to women residents, non-residents and ex-residents, by type of service, 2003/04**

	In-house services provided by shelters to women:					
	Residents		Non-residents		Ex-residents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Advocacy	419	89	292	62	319	67
Individual short-term counselling	413	87	303	64	313	66
Housing referral	397	84	213	45	216	46
Parenting skills	362	77	187	40	218	46
Life skills	347	73	146	31	186	39
Legal services	326	69	232	49	245	52
Financial assistance/welfare	314	66	198	42	216	46
Services for women with disabilities	307	65	177	37	178	38
Crisis telephone line	305	64	339	72	308	65
Culturally sensitive services for Aboriginal women	301	64	193	41	198	42
Culturally sensitive services for ethno-cultural and visible minority women	298	63	176	37	183	39
Lesbian sensitive services	292	62	188	40	182	38
Group counselling	290	61	179	38	190	40
Mental health services	266	56	180	38	179	38
Recreation services	226	48	49	10	88	19
Medical services	225	48	130	27	142	30
Addiction counselling	203	43	125	26	137	29
Specialized services for older women (55 years and older)	162	34	91	19	95	20
Individual long-term counselling	160	34	157	33	180	38
Job training/employment search	121	26	54	11	71	15
Family counselling programs	78	16	46	10	51	11
Other ²	102	22	72	15	84	18

1. Service reported as a percentage of 473 responding facilities.

2. 'Other' may include services such as support groups, education workshops, literacy programs, services for transgender women and sexual assault counselling/programs.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Transition Home Survey, 2003/04.

Table B5.3**Number of peace bonds issued in adult criminal court and the number of breaches, selected jurisdictions, 2003/04**

	Peace bonds issued	Convicted cases of breaches of peace bonds	Breach rate ¹
	Number	Number	Percent
Nova Scotia	807	47	6
Quebec	3,577	257	7
Ontario	7,213	205	3
Saskatchewan	410	89	22
Alberta	2,460	161	7
Yukon	53	0	...
Total jurisdictions	14,520	759	5

... not applicable

1. The breach rate represents the number of convicted cases of breaches of peace bonds divided by the number of issued during the reference year. Convicted cases may be for breaches of peace bonds issued in an earlier year and not necessarily the reference year.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Adult Criminal Court Survey.

Table B5.4**Number and percentage of stalking victims who sought a protective order against their stalker during the past 5 years, 2004**

	Total		Sex of victim			
			Female victims		Male victims	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
	Thousands		Thousands		Thousands	
Total stalking victims	2,330	100	1,448	100	882	100
Obtained a protective order	248	11	169	12	79	9
Type of court in which protective order was obtained						
Total	248	100	169	100	79	100
Criminal court (criminal justice system)	162	65	102	60	60	76
Family court (civil justice system)	50	20	42	25	F	F
Not stated/Don't know	36	15	25	15 ^E	F	F
Violation of protective order						
Total	248	100	169	100	79	100
Protective order was violated	120	49	83	49	38	48
Protective order was not violated	120	49	83	49	37	47
Not stated/Don't know	F	F	F	F	F	F

^E use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

Note: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey on Victimization, 2004.

Table B5.5**Number of applications for criminal injuries compensation or financial benefits for victims of crime, by province and status of applications, 2002/03**

	Total applications		New applications		Applications brought forward from a previous year		Applications carried forward to the next year		Total applications adjudicated or concluded	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Prince Edward Island	122	100	44	36	78	64	107	88	15	12
Nova Scotia	351	100	280	80	71	20	49	14	302	86
New Brunswick	384	100	298	78	86	22	125	33	259	67
Quebec	5,957	100	4,287	72	1,670	28	1,873	31	4,084	69
Ontario	9,981	100	4,976	50	5,005	50	6,265	63	3,716	37
Manitoba	662	100	636	96	26	4	26	4	636	96
Saskatchewan	438	100	372	85	66	15	85	19	353	81
Alberta	1,906	100	1,455	76	451	24	397	21	1,509	79
Total	19,801	100	12,348	62	7,453	38	8,927	45	10,874	55

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Victim Services Survey.

Table B5.6**Number of criminal injuries compensation and financial benefit applications, by decision and amount awarded, 2002/03**

	Total applications adjudicated or concluded		Applications allowed		Applications disallowed		Applications where decision pending or other status		Total amount awarded in 2002/03
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	(thousands)
Prince Edward Island	18	100	16	89	0	0	2	11	\$57
Nova Scotia	302	100	208	69	69	23	25	8	\$416
New Brunswick	259	100	235	91	14	5	10	4	\$260
Quebec	4,084	100	2,774	68	796	19	514	13	\$47,049
Ontario	3,716	100	2,419	65	92	2	1,205	32	\$13,858
Manitoba	636	100	474	75	142	22	20	3	\$3,154
Saskatchewan	353	100	287	81	60	17	6	2	\$311
Alberta	1,509	100	1,171	78	338	22	0	0	\$5,598
Total	10,877	100	7,584	70	1,511	14	1,782	16	\$70,702

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Victim Services Survey.

C. The Context of Crime

This section of the Criminal Justice Indicators report presents data on a broad set of environmental contexts, including a range of factors in individuals' backgrounds and life experiences which may influence one's risk of offending or being victimized. This context helps to better understand the workload and performance of the criminal justice system. The factors presented in this section are organized into three broad categories: *Community and society*, *Family*, and *Individual*.

Within each of these broad categories, various factors that have been identified or theorized in research literature as associated with crime are examined. By understanding the effect of events and circumstances over one's life course, meaning from pre-natal stages to adulthood, policy and program interventions can be developed where they would be most effective. It is important to note that while the factors within the broad categories of *Community and Society*, *Family* and *Individual* are presented separately, they frequently do not occur in isolation of one another and are often interlinked.

C1. Community and society

The economic well-being and the characteristics of our communities and our society as a whole exert an important influence on crime, victimization, and fear and perceptions of crime. The economic well-being of nation, community or individual can have an impact on crime and victimization by, for instance, determining purchasing power and the availability of and access to resources and positive opportunities. Further, the extent to which communities are cohesive, inclusive and supportive of its members can positively influence outcomes, even for those whose family and individual characteristics would otherwise place them at risk of becoming an offender or victim of crime. Informal social control within communities can be important to the local management of crime, which may be accomplished through mechanisms that extend beyond formal policing and are rooted in community structures, extended family kinship patterns, neighbourliness and the legitimate authority accorded to community leaders. Other influencing factors can include the diversity of communities, situational contexts such as land use and housing mix, or the degree of social and physical disorder.

C1.1 Age of the population¹¹³


Younger populations at higher risk of offending

Age is one of the most commonly cited correlates of criminal activity and delinquency. Some researchers have observed the relationship of demographic structure of the population in terms of the "compositional effects" on crime (South and Messner, 2000; Pottie Bunge et al., 2005). That is, changes in the composition (size) of the most criminogenic groups will have an effect on crime. Typically, the groups that tend to be most criminally active are male teenagers and young adults.

According to a non-representative sample of 122 police services reporting to the Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR2) Survey in 2003, persons aged 15 to 24 years accounted for 45% of those accused of property crimes and 32% of those

accused of violent crimes, but only represented 14% of the overall population. The most crime prone years were between 15 and 18 years old, as the highest number of crimes per 100,000 population were committed by this age group (Figure C1.1). Persons aged 25 to 34 years old are also disproportionately involved in crime. In 2003, they committed 18% of property offences and 22% of violent offences, but, like 15- to 24-year-olds, only represented 14% of the total population.

Figure C1.1
Rate of property and violent crime highest among young people, 2003




Note: Data are based on a non-representative sample of 122 police services in 9 provinces and represent 61% of the national volume reported actual (substantiated) *Criminal Code* incidents.
Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting Survey, 2003.

As the proportion of young people declines, so do crime rates¹¹⁴


Figures C1.2 and C1.3 show how the rise of the property and violent crime rates in the 1960s and 1970s roughly parallels the growth in the proportion of the high-risk age groups. This growth in the younger age groups was caused by the large birth cohort between 1947 and 1966, also known as the baby boom. A significantly smaller birth cohort replaced this generation, which was associated with a subsequent decrease in the proportion of persons aged 15 to 24 and 25 to 34 years in the early 1990s.

Shifts in crime patterns in Canada have generally followed the pattern expected based on changes in the population. There appears to be more of a relationship between population shifts and property crimes than violent crime. For example, both property crimes and violent crimes continued to rise between 1960 and 1980, a time when baby-boomers reached 15 years of age. As the percentage of the population aged 15 to 24 years old began to decrease in the 1980s, property crime rates began to stabilize with a slight increase in the early 1990s and then a sudden decline (Figure C1.2).

In the case of violent crime, rates increased steadily until 1993 (Figure C1.3). Therefore the drop in violent crime only began several years following the decline of the 15 to 24 age group. Given that violent crimes are typically committed by older offenders on average than property crimes, it is not surprising that the change in violent crime rates follows a more delayed pattern.

Figure C1.2**Comparison over time in rates of property crime and population accounted for by age groups, 1962 to 2004**

Sources: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey; and Demography Division, Estimates of Population.

Figure C1.3**Comparison over time in rates of violent crime and population accounted for by age groups, 1962 to 2004**

Sources: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey; and, Demography Division, Estimates of Population.

The extended period of growth in the violent crime rate may partially be explained by Ouimet (2002) who asserts that the large cohort born in the 1960s experienced a type of strain due to more serious difficulties integrating into the job market during the recession in the early 1980s. This occurrence had the effect of creating a cohort of offenders who were criminally active for a longer period than any other cohort.

Other researchers have attempted to examine the complex relationship between age and crime and some of the empirical research has led to different conclusions. While some researchers propose that shifts in age composition only contribute to a small variation in crime (Steffensmeier and Harer, 1999; Levitt, 1999) others have


found that certain offence types are more affected by changes in age structure, such as homicide (Leenaars and Lester, 2004; Sprott and Cesaroni, 2002), robbery, and break and enter (Carrington, 2001; Pottie Bunge et al., 2005).

Western provinces have younger populations

The higher crime rate in the western provinces may be partly explained by the younger population (Figure C1.4). According to the 2001 Census, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba had the lowest median age among all the provinces, while the Northwest Territories and Nunavut had the lowest median age nationally. Conversely, the lower crime rates reported by many of the Atlantic provinces and Quebec may be partly the result of their aging population. The median age of the four Atlantic provinces¹¹⁵ has been increasing in recent years, while the age of Quebec’s population has been growing for over twenty years.

It is noteworthy that age cannot solely account for geographic variations in crime. Exceptions such as Ontario’s younger profile but lower crime rate and British Columbia’s older population and higher crime rate highlights the need to examine socio-demographic factors that go beyond the simple one-to-one relationship between age structure and crime.

Figure C1.4
Populations in western provinces are younger and crime rates higher, 2004



Sources: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey; and, Demography Division, Estimates of Population.


Aboriginal population is younger than the non-Aboriginal population¹¹⁶

Overall, Canada’s Aboriginal population is younger than the non-Aboriginal population because of higher fertility rates among Aboriginal women (Statistics Canada, 2003c). Nationally, children 14 years of age and under account for 33% of the Aboriginal population, compared to 19% within the non-Aboriginal population (Figure C1.5). In certain jurisdictions, such as Saskatchewan, Nunavut and Manitoba, the proportion of the Aboriginal population under 15 years old is higher than the national average (Figure C1.6). As this group reaches the high-risk age group for the commission of crime (15 to 24 years), it is possible that there may be a corresponding increase in the rate of crime in these regions.

Fluctuations in other social and economic conditions also interact with demographic conditions (Pottie Bunge et al., 2005), as will be elaborated on in other sections of this report. For example, a community's ability to provide social control can be weakened with population growth, which may be caused by such factors as large birth cohorts (Bursik, 1988). A reduction in informal social control may lead to greater prevalence of crime. In addition, crime rates tend to be higher among large birth cohorts because of the impact of the large population on social institutions and later economic opportunities (Easterlin, 1987; Levitt, 1999; South and Messner, 2000; Savolainen, 2000; Ouimet, 2002). Specifically, when the large birth cohort reaches adolescence, increased youth offending can be a product of the overload on the family and school institutions, which are unable to exert adequate social control over youth. In addition, the large birth cohort develops material aspirations throughout their childhood but does not have sufficient opportunities in later life to achieve material success because of limited employment in a crowded labour market. This strain can lead to higher crime rates.


Figure C1.5

Aboriginal population younger than the non-Aboriginal population, 2001



Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division, 2001 Census of Population. Data are available free at www.statcan.ca in *Aboriginal Peoples of Canada, 2001 Census*. Statistics Canada catalogue no.97F0011XCB2001002.

Figure C1.6
Aboriginal populations are youngest in Saskatchewan, Nunavut and Manitoba, 2001



Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division, 2001 Census of Population. Data are available free at www.statcan.ca in *Aboriginal Peoples of Canada, 2001 Census*. Statistics Canada catalogue no.97F0011XCB2001002.

C1.2 Gender

Historically, males have accounted for the large majority of offenders and previous research has demonstrated that gender is a factor associated with crime and delinquency (Fitzgerald, 2003). In 2003, males accounted for 81% persons charged by the police, a trend which has held constant. Looking more closely at offending patterns among the younger age cohorts, it is evident the highest rates of offending are recorded for young males. In 2003, the rate of male youth who were charged with violent crimes was over two times higher than the rate of female youth charged (118 versus 44 per 10,000). It was also double the rate for all adults (44 per 10,000).¹¹⁷ Similar patterns are found regarding property offences, where male youth were over three times more likely to be charged with property crimes than female youth (214 versus 60 per 10,000) and over four times more than adults (52 per 10,000).

In addition to being the group most likely to commit crime, research has also shown that being young and being male are the strongest predictors of being the victim of a non-spousal violent crime (Mihorean, 2001).¹¹⁸ Yet despite this finding, research also indicates that young males are the least likely to worry about being the victim of a crime (Ogg, 2001).

C1.3 Immigration and visible minorities¹¹⁹

Immigration increasing


With decreasing birth rates, Canada's population growth is now driven largely by immigration rather than natural growth and, unlike prior to the 1960s, immigrants are increasingly from non-European places of birth (Statistics Canada, 2003f; and, Bélanger and Caron Malenfant, 2005). In 2003, immigration accounted for 60% of the nation's population growth and population projections suggest that by the year 2020, the growth of our nation will be completely dependant upon immigration.

These present and projected changes to our population landscape hold many implications for the justice system, including ensuring equity and access to the justice system, as well as programs for victims, offenders and those at risk.

At the time of the 2001 Census, individuals who immigrated to Canada accounted for the highest proportion (18%) of the population since 1931 (22%) (Statistics Canada, 2003e) (Figure C1.7). This can be attributed to the fact that 2.2 million immigrants entered the country between 1991 and 2000, one of the highest numbers since the early 1900s.¹²⁰

Figure C1.7

Canada's immigrant population accounts for the highest proportion of the population in 70 years




Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division, Census of Population.

Immigrants now more likely to be from non-European places of birth

The most frequent countries of birth among immigrants have changed. As indicated previously in Section B4, prior to the 1960s, the majority of immigrants were of European descent, or from the United States. Following changes to Canada's immigration policies and international events related to migrants and refugees, a greater percentage of immigrants from the 1960s onward originated from non-European countries, particularly Asian nations (Statistics Canada, 2003f). Of those who immigrated to Canada in the 1990s, 58% were born in Asian and Middle Eastern countries and one in five emigrated from Europe (Figure C1.8). In particular, the People's Republic of China was the most common country of origin, followed by India, the Philippines, the Special Administrative Region (SAR) of Hong Kong, Sri Lanka, Pakistan and Taiwan.

The settlement areas of choice among immigrants are Canada's three largest urban areas. According to the 2001 Census, 43% of those who immigrated in the 1990s settled in the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA), 18% in the Vancouver CMA and 12% in the CMA of Montréal.

Figure C1.8
Immigrants are increasingly from Asia and the Middle East



Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division, Census of Population.

Canada's visible minority population is growing

The increase in immigration and the shift in the countries of origin, have contributed to a sizeable growth in the visible minority population¹²¹ (Statistics Canada, 2003f). In particular, the visible minority population in Canada has grown more than three and half times over the last twenty years from 1.1 million in 1981 to 4.0 million in 2001. As a proportion of the total population, it has risen from 5% to 13%. Recent population projections estimate that by 2017 between 17% and 23% of Canada's population will be a member of a visible minority (Bélanger and Caron Malenfant, 2005).

One in six Canadians speak a mother tongue other than English or French

Such increasing diversity also means diverse languages. In 2001, almost one in six Canadians had a mother tongue other than English or French, with the most common languages being Chinese, Italian, German, Punjabi and Spanish (Statistics Canada, 2002a).

Economic well-being

The association between economic well-being and crime have been the focus of much research. In particular, it has been argued that economic deprivation and lack of employment affect the level of crime in a community by weakening social bonds and order, and creating fewer legitimate opportunities required for acquiring goods and services (Sampson and Laub, 1990, 1993; Agnew et. al, 1996, Merton, 1968; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960).

For the purpose of this publication, the economic health of Canada is measured by examining indicators of the overall national economy, as well as the income and labour force participation of Canadians. Data on the national economy are based on

the Gross Domestic Product and inflation rates. Information on individual and family income and employment are based on the income levels of Canadians, unemployment rates, the rate of government transfers, and measures of income inequality.


C1.4 The national economy

Gross Domestic Product has been steadily increasing since the early 1990s

The Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the sum of all the goods and services produced in Canada, is a sign of the health of the economy as it demonstrates periods of economic booms and recessions. The national GDP has posted annual gains since the economic slowdown in the early 1990s. The GDP grew an additional 2.8% in 2004, reaching \$1.12 trillion in chained 1997 dollars (Figure C1.9) (Statistics Canada, 2005b).¹²² With the exception of Newfoundland and Labrador, which posted a slight decline (-0.7%) after two consecutive years of strong growth, all provinces and territories experienced an increase between 2003 and 2004 (Statistics Canada, 2005c).

Figure C1.9

The Gross Domestic Product has steadily increased since the early 1990s¹



1. The dollars reflect real GDP, expenditure-based amounts.

2. Chained dollars were adopted by Income and Expenditure Accounts on May 31, 2001 as the official measure of real GDP in terms of expenditures. Its method provides users with a more accurate measure of real GDP between two consecutive periods and makes the Canadian measure comparable to that of the United States. For more information, see Statistics Canada. 2005. National Income and Expenditure Accounts. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 13-001. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.

Sources: Statistics Canada, Income and Expenditure Accounts Division, and; Prices Division, Consumer Price Index. CANSIM Table 380-0017.

A number of factors can influence the level of growth in the GDP, such as the demand for products and services, as well as gains or losses in different sectors. Unforeseen conditions such as those that have an impact on exports (e.g., the increase in the Canadian dollar and mad cow disease) and tourism (e.g., Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome) can have a considerable effect on economic performance (Statistics Canada, 2003g).

The GDP can also be assessed on a per capita basis; that is, the total output per person. In fact, this measure has often been used as an indication of prosperity and standard of living. A recent Statistics Canada study (Baldwin et al., 2004) examined

GDP per capita since 1990. The report noted that the annual average growth rate between 1990 and 1997 was 0.9%, followed by a rebound with an annual increase of 2.7% between 1997 and 2003.


Inflation high in the 1970s and 1980s

Inflation rates measure changes in the prices of goods and services and therefore, the purchasing power of consumers. The effect of inflation on the economic health of Canadians will be strongest when the level of inflation increases at a rate exceeding that of the total income of individuals, as it results in reduced purchasing power.

Inflation, measured by the Consumer Price Index,¹²³ increased significantly in the 1970s and 1980s when the price of goods and services from one year to the next cost Canadians anywhere from 8% to 12% more. Due to these high inflation rates, inflation control targets were adopted in 1991 with the goal of lowering the yearly consumer price index to 3% (plus or minus 1%) by the end of 1992, and then to 2% (plus or minus 1%) by the end of 1995. Currently, the inflation target is at 2% (plus or minus 1%). Researchers have noted that a more stable inflation rate can affect larger economic stability (Longworth, 2002).


While rates of property and violent crime have generally been decreasing since the 1990s when inflation targets were established (Figures C1.10 and C1.11), recent research has established a link between the inflation rate and certain types of “financially motivated” crimes. Specifically, Pottie Bunge et al. (2005) found a marginal association between the inflation rate and robbery, motor vehicle theft and break and enter.¹²⁴ In other words, as the inflation rate increases (or decreases), so too does the rate for these types of crimes.

Figure C1.10
Comparison over time of rates of property crime and inflation, 1962 to 2004



Sources: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey; and Prices Division, Consumer Price Index.

Figure C1.11
Comparison over time of rates of violent crime and inflation, 1962 to 2004



Sources: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey; and Prices Division, Consumer Price Index.

C1.5 Income and labour force participation of individuals and families


Income of Canadians can be measured in both absolute terms (income levels) and relative terms (income inequality). Absolute measures of income and labour force participation have been linked to crime in terms of their relationship to economic strain and informal social controls (Merton, 1968, Sampson and Laub 1993).

Average after-tax income generally increasing¹²⁵

The wealth of Canadians can be measured by examining average income in dollars. Between 1994 and 1996, the average after-tax income of families and unattached individuals¹²⁶ was fairly stable at about \$42,250 annually, but increased rapidly after 1996 reaching \$48,800 in 2002 (Figure C1.12). In 2003, the average after-tax income dipped slightly to \$48,400. A number of factors can contribute to these trends, including the level of income taxes and government transfers, as well as labour market conditions (e.g., unemployment rates).

Figure C1.12

Average after-tax annual income for families and unattached individuals increased since 1996¹



1. After-tax income refers to the amount after income taxes are paid and government transfers are received. Amounts refer to average after-tax income for families of two or more persons and unattached individuals.
2. In order to create constant dollar figures with the effects of inflation removed, figures were converted to a base of 2003=100 using Statistics Canada's Consumer Price Index.


Sources: Statistics Canada, Income Statistics Division, Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics, Cansim Table 202-0603, and; Prices Division, Consumer Price Index.

Proportion of Canadians living below the low-income cut-off held steady in 2003¹²⁷

The most financially-deprived Canadians are often referred to as those who fall below the low-income cut-off, meaning they usually spend 64% or more of their income on food, shelter and clothing.¹²⁸ It is estimated that in 2003, 11.5% of Canadians lived on after-tax incomes that set them below the low-income cut-off, a figure which has remained virtually unchanged since 2001. After increasing fairly steadily from 1990 to 1996, the percentage of Canadians living under such financial conditions decreased steadily until 2001 (Figure C1.13). Among children and youth under the age of 18, the trend has followed a similar pattern to the overall population, but the rate of young people living below the low income cut-off level has always been higher. The financial situation of seniors has improved steadily over the last few decades: in 1980, 21.3% of seniors lived below the low income cut-off level compared to 6.8% in 2003. This may be attributable to improved pensions, better retirement planning and government transfers.

Figure C1.13

Proportion of persons living below the low-income cut-off has decreased since 1996, but seniors have experienced a steady decrease over the long term




Source: Statistics Canada, Income Division, Survey of Income and Labour Dynamics. CANSIM Table 202-0802.

Proportion of children living in low-income families dropped over last six years

In general, financial deprivation can affect the entire family by heightening family stress. According to data on after-tax low-income cut-offs, the proportion of children living in low-income families has been steadily decreasing since peaking in 1996 (Figure C1.14). In particular, 12.4% of children under the age of 18 in 2003 were living in low income situations, down from 18.6% in 1996. Prior to the peak in 1996, the proportion of children in low income families had been growing. Researchers have noted that the low-income rate among children typically grows in periods of recessions and declines during periods of economic expansions (Picot and Myles, 1995).

Figure C1.14

Lone-parent families most likely to live below the low-income cut-off, 2003¹



1. After-tax low income cut-offs (1992 base) were determined from an analysis of the 1992 Family Expenditure Survey data. These income limits were selected on the basis that families with incomes below these limits usually spent 64% or more of their income on food, shelter and clothing. Low income cut-offs were differentiated by community size of residence and family size.

Source: Statistics Canada, Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics. CANSIM Table 202-0804.


Rates of low-income among lone-parent families have declined since mid-1990s, but remain at one-third

Family situation has an important impact on the low-income rate. For instance, families with two parents were the least likely to be living in low-income, with 6.6% or 210,000 falling below the low-income cut-off in 2003 (Figure C1.13). This compares to 29.4% of unattached individuals (1,287,000) and 33.6% of lone-parent families (223,000). In general, unattached men fared better than women in 2003, as 30.7% of unattached working-age men were living in a low-income situation, compared to 37.5% of unattached working-age women. For all family types, rates remained constant from 2002 to 2003.

Historically, lone-parent families and unattached individuals have always been the most likely to fall below the low income cut-off level. While trends for all family types followed similar patterns from 1980 to 1996, year-over-year changes have always been more dramatic for lone-parent families and unattached individuals (Figure C1.15). While rates began to drop for all types of families after 1996, the decrease was much more accelerated for lone-parent families, falling from almost half (48.9%) of lone-parent families living below the low income cut-off in 1996 to less than one-third (30.1%) in 2001. Unfortunately, the rate for lone-parent families moved upward in 2002, rising to 34.8%. This increase was driven by a growth in the proportion of female lone-parent families with low income. In 2002, 39.4% of lone-parent families headed by women were below the low-income cut-off, an increase from 33.8% in 2001. In contrast, the rate of low-income single-parent families headed by males remained relatively constant at around 12%¹²⁹.

Figure C1.15

Despite decreasing since the mid-1990s, the percentage of families under the low-income cut-off¹ continues to be highest among lone parent families



1. After-tax low income cut-offs (1992 base) were determined from an analysis of the 1992 Family Expenditure Survey data. These income limits were selected on the basis that families with incomes below these limits usually spent 64% or more of their income on food, shelter and clothing. Low income cut-offs were differentiated by community size of residence and family size.

Source: Statistics Canada, Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics. CANSIM Table 202-028.


Women more likely employed in low-paying jobs

Over the years, the make-up of the Canadian labour market has undergone significant changes. The economy has shifted away from its dependency on natural resources to one that is reliant on a highly skilled and educated workforce (Statistics Canada, 2003h). This change to a knowledge-based economy has meant that low-skilled and under-educated workers experience difficulty competing in the current labour structure and

are overrepresented in low-paying service sector and administrative jobs. Indeed, workers with less than a high school education accounted for over 60% of Canadians in the lowest earning category (Statistics Canada and the Council of Ministers of Education, 2003).

In 2002, one in four Canadians (26%) were employed in service sector jobs, namely sales and service occupations (Figure C1.16). Women were more likely than men to be working in these occupations (32% versus 20%) (Figure C1.17). While sales and service occupations do not necessarily denote low-paying positions, certain positions including retail, child care, home support, and hospitality work are often marked by low-pay, instability, and lack of medical, health and pension benefits. In fact, these low-paying positions represented 69% of occupations in the sales and services sector. Women were more likely than men to be employed in these particular positions (25% versus 11%). In addition, clerical and administration positions were more common among women, with 24% of women being employed in these positions, compared to 7% of men.


Figure C1.16
Sales and service jobs most common in the Canadian population, 2002



Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Statistics Division, Labour Force Survey.

Moving out of low-paying positions is often difficult. A study based on the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics found that less than half (47%) of low-paid workers¹³⁰ in 1996 were able to move into higher paid employment by 2001 (Janz, 2004). Older women and with less than high school education were least likely to have upward job mobility.

Figure C1.17
One in three women working in sales and service sector jobs, 2002



Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Statistics Division, Labour Force Survey.


Unemployment decreased in 2004¹³¹

Employment is the primary source of income for working-age Canadians. Consequently, the lack of employment may serve to decrease economic opportunities for acquiring desirable consumer goods. In addition, the absence of job stability and commitment to work can weaken conventional social attachments, bonds and controls (Sampson and Laub, 1990 and 1993).

After remaining stable in 2003, the unemployment rate decreased to 7.2% in 2004. This decrease was driven by gains in employment in the areas of construction; professional, scientific and technical services; finance, insurance, real estate and leasing; and, natural resources (Statistics Canada, 2004a).


Unemployment and other measures of poverty have often been cited as risk factors for criminal activity. This may be particularly true for unattached individuals and young persons who do not have marriage or family responsibilities. Recognizing that other factors are at play, Figures C1.18 and C1.19 show a similar trend between unemployment rates and crime, particularly property crime where the trends run quite parallel to one another.

Figure C1.18
Comparison over time in rates of property crime and unemployment, 1962 to 2004



Sources: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey; and, Labour Statistics Division, Labour Force Survey. CANSIM Table 282-0002.

Figure C1.19
Comparison over time in rates of violent crime and unemployment, 1962 to 2004



Sources: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey; and, Labour Statistics Division, Labour Force Survey. CANSIM Table 282-0002.

Among the most at-risk group for criminal offending and victimization, namely young males aged 15 to 24, the unemployment rate in 2004 was double that of the Canadian population (14.9% versus 7.2%). In comparison, women in the same age group had an unemployment rate of 11.8%. While the unemployment rate among young males tends to follow the same pattern as the overall unemployment rate, rates on average are almost 80% higher.

Previous research on unemployment as an indicator of economic well-being has remarked that along with overall trends in unemployment rates, it is important to consider the duration of the job search (Dubé, 2004). This is because shorter terms of unemployment may stem from normal labour turnover, while long-term unemployment may be caused by structural conditions in the labour market.

Using the Labour Force Survey, Dubé (2004) found that long-term unemployment (12 months or greater) was more common during periods of recessions when labour demands were lower, including the early 1980s and 1990s. Although the incidence of long-term unemployment has decreased since peaking in 1994, the incidences in 2003 was still 39% higher than in 1990 and over twice as high as in 1977. A more recent study shows that certain groups are over-represented among the chronically unemployed, meaning among those who spent between 48% and 99% of their time between 1993 and 2001 in the labour force in unemployment (Brooks, 2005). These groups included those who had not graduated from high school, residents of Quebec and the Atlantic provinces, older workers, members of visible minority groups and people with disabilities.


Rates of government transfers decreased slightly for unattached individuals in 2003¹³²

Social transfers for lower-income persons are an important income source for many Canadians. Therefore, the availability of supports for individuals and families, particularly supports designed to supplement the incomes of lower income families and individuals, can have an important impact on a community's economic health. The reliance of individuals on transfers can also be an indication of financial need.

Government transfers comprise a variety of programs. They include temporary financial assistance for those that have lost their jobs or are away from work due to sickness or the birth of a child (Employment Insurance), income assistance for families with children (e.g., child tax benefit and other child credits and allowances), financial supports for seniors (e.g., Canadian Pension Plan and Old Age Security), and various other programs (e.g., provincial and municipal social assistance programs and GST/HST Credit). Trends in certain programs, such as some unemployment benefits under Employment Insurance, are tied to changes in labour market, while others, such as financial supports to seniors, are largely unaffected by market shifts. Non-seniors programs and those aimed at lower income families and individuals may have a greater influence on overall levels of crime, since younger individuals are more at-risk of being an offender and/or victim.

On average, individuals and families received \$7,000 in government transfers in 2003, unchanged from the previous year (Figure C1.20). Families of two or more persons received an average of \$7,800, while unattached individuals received \$5,400, a \$200 decrease from 2002.

Figure C1.20
Average government transfers remained unchanged in 2003



1. In order to create constant dollar figures with the effects of inflation removed, figures were converted to a base of 2003=100 using Statistics Canada's Consumer Price Index.
2. Includes economic families and unattached individuals.
3. An economic family is defined as a group of two or more persons who live in the same dwelling and are related to each other by blood, marriage, common law or adoption.
4. An unattached individual is a person living either alone or with others to whom he or she is unrelated, such as roommates or a lodger.

Source: Statistics Canada, Income Statistics Division, Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics. CANSIM Table 202-0301.

Canada-wide, government transfers represented 11% of the total after-tax income. Among the provinces, transfers as a proportion of total income were highest among the Atlantic provinces and lowest in Alberta and Ontario.

Lowest income families receive over one-quarter of government transfers

As in previous years, the most common recipients of government transfers were situated in the lowest income brackets. For example, in 2003, over one-quarter (28%) of government transfers went to families of two persons or more with the lowest-income (or lowest quintile¹³³) (Table C1.1). The proportion of transfers was similar to the peak recorded in 2000 (31%). In comparison, 12% of transfers in 2003 were paid to the highest-income earning families (or highest quintile).

The lowest income families (two persons or more) are also the most dependent on government transfers as a source of income. More than half (55%) of the after tax income among the lowest-income families came from government sources. This reliance decreases as family's after-tax income increases.

Among the working age (non-senior) population, the highest average government transfers were among families without earnings¹³⁴. Two-parent families without earnings received the greatest dollar amount at about \$15,600 annually. Lone-parent mothers received the second highest amount at \$13,500. However, the dollar amounts for both economic family types were slightly lower than the previous year (-3% and -5%, respectively).

C1.6 Income inequality¹³⁵

Like income and labour force participation, relative measures of income, namely income inequality, have also been connected to crime. Theories have argued that relative deprivation contributes to criminality in that it can cause anger and frustration among those with less and that these feelings may be expressed in the form of violent or property crime (e.g. Hagan and Peterson, 1995). Other theories have built on the idea that inequality leads individuals to lessen the gap through illegitimate means (Merton, 1938) or that it leads to social disorganization through a breakdown of social cohesion and social norms (Shaw and MacKay, 1942; Blau and Blau, 1986; Wilson, 1987). While several studies have found that income inequality is a predictor of homicide and other violent crimes (Baily, 1984; Blau and Blau, 1986; Krahn et al., 1986; Messner, 1989; Land et al, 1990; Hsieh and Pugh, 1993; Kennedy et al., 1996), others have qualified such conclusions by finding less positive associations through the application of different methodologies (Neumayer, 2005; Messner et al, 2002).

Income disparity between the lowest and highest income Canadians has increased since 1994


Income inequality or relative deprivation can be assessed by looking at the average annual income differential between Canadians with the lowest and highest incomes. The dollar difference in the average after-tax income among the 20% lowest income Canadians (lowest quintile¹³⁶) compared to the 20% highest income Canadians (highest quintile) increased by 23% from 1996 to 2002, but then stabilized in 2003 at a difference of \$96,600 (Statistics Canada, 2005d). The increase in income disparity can be explained by the fact that after-tax income for those in the lowest quintile only increased by 15% (or \$2,800) between 1996 and 2003 whereas for those in the highest income quintile, after-tax income rose by 19% (or \$18,500).

Income inequality, as measured by the Gini coefficient for after-tax income, remained stable in 2003

Another measurement of the degree of income inequality is based on the Gini coefficient. This indicator refers to a number between zero and one: zero representing perfect income equality (no variation in income throughout the population) and one representing complete income inequality (one person received all the income and the remainder of the population received none) (Statistics Canada, 2005d). Income inequality can be assessed over time by looking at changes in the Gini coefficient.

The Gini coefficients for after-tax income for all economic families, meaning those with two persons or more and unattached individuals, were relatively stable during the early 1990s, hovering at approximately 0.36.¹³⁷ The level of income inequality then increased from 1996 to 2000, reaching a rate of 0.39 and has remained stable (Figure C1.21).

Gini coefficients have been historically higher for market income (before taxes and government transfers). After peaking in 1997 at 0.52, Gini coefficients for market income have fallen to 0.51 in 2003.

Figure C1.21**Income inequality, as measured by the Gini coefficient for after-tax income, relatively stable in 2003¹**

1. The Gini coefficient is an indicator that refers to a number between zero and one, with zero representing perfect income equality (no variation in income throughout the population) and one representing complete inequality (one person received all the income and the remainder of the population received none). The Gini coefficient in this figure is for all economic families (families with two or more persons and unattached individuals).

2. Income after income taxes and receipt of government transfers.

Source: Statistics Canada, Incomes Statistics Division, Survey of Consumer Finances and Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics. CANSIM Table 202-0705.

C1.7 Urbanization

Populations in large urban centres growing faster than anywhere else in Canada

Urbanization has become a central feature of Canadian society and researchers have argued that various factors that can characterize urbanization, such as diverse and dense populations, financial inequality and social exclusion, influence levels of crime and violence (Wirth, 1938; Fischer, 1975; Hagan, 1977; McCarthy, 1991).¹³⁸ Further, victimization data show that rates of victimization are higher in urban areas compared to rural areas (Gannon and Mihorean, 2005; Brzozowski, 2001). The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development found that Canada is among the countries with the highest levels of urbanization (Statistics Canada, 2002b). The most recent Census of the Population (2001) revealed that about eight in ten Canadians resided in an urban centre with a population of 10,000 or more¹³⁹ (Bollman, 2004). This represents a small increase from the urban share recorded in the 1996 (78%) and 1991 (77%) census periods, but a significant jump from those recorded in the census periods of the 1970s (average of 66% urbanization) and early 1980s (70%).

In 2001, the only province with less than 50% of the population residing in urban areas was Newfoundland and Labrador. This differs from thirty years ago, when the majority of the populations in the Atlantic provinces and the province of Saskatchewan resided in rural and small town areas (Bollman, 2004).

Changes in the share of population residing in urban and rural areas are influenced by differing levels of growth, caused by natural increase, immigration and migration. Census-to-census growth rates between 1996 and 2001 were highest for census metropolitan areas (CMAs) (+6.2%), which outpaced the 4% national average growth rate (Bollman, 2004). On the other hand, urban areas with populations between 10,000 and 99,999 experienced a small growth rate at +1.5%, while the population in rural and small town areas failed to maintain their past census-to-census increases by remaining virtually unchanged (-0.4%).¹⁴⁰


The faster rate of growth among the CMAAs is often driven by population growth in the surrounding areas or suburbs. Known as the “donut” effect, the census-to-census growth rate for municipalities just outside the urban core was almost double that of the urban centre (+8.5% versus +4.3%) (Statistics Canada, 2002b). This was the case for almost all CMAAs, excluding Ottawa-Hull and Abbotsford.

Twenty of the twenty-seven largest urban areas grew from 1996 to 2001¹⁴¹

Despite overall urban growth, there were significant variations in population change among the 27 Census Metropolitan Areas. In particular, one-quarter (or 7 CMAAs) recorded drops in their population (Figure C1.22). Among the growing CMAAs, there were variations in the magnitude of growth. In particular, an analysis of census data showed that CMAAs located in three regions generally experienced the largest increases in population: the extended Golden Horseshoe¹⁴² in southern Ontario, the Calgary-Edmonton corridor, and British Columbia’s Lower Mainland and southern Vancouver Island¹⁴³ (Statistics Canada, 2002b).

International immigration was the leading explanation for the growth in the extended Golden Horseshoe, the Lower Mainland and southern Vancouver Island, and Windsor (Statistics Canada, 2002b). For Ottawa-Hull, it was a combination of internal migration, international immigration and natural increase, while for Halifax, it was a mix of international immigration and natural increase. The growth in the Calgary-Edmonton corridor was largely attributed to migration from other provinces and natural increase.

Figure C1.22
Census Metropolitan Area growth rates, 1996 to 2001



Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division, Census of Population.

C1.8 Housing mix: Renters, owners and housing type¹⁴⁴

Theories of crime and victimization suggest that the composition and structure of communities affect social interaction, social disorder and levels of crime (see Fitzgerald et al., 2004; Sampson and Raudenbush, 2001). For instance, in a study of neighbourhood characteristics and crime patterns in Winnipeg, Fitzgerald et al (2004) examined, among several other variables, land-use and housing characteristics. The research found that neighbourhoods with the highest violent crime rates also had greater proportions of commercial zoning and multiple-family residential zoning, and lower proportions of single-family residential zoning and owner-occupied dwellings. Similar characteristics were found in areas with high property crime rates.

According to the 2001 Census of the Population, 66% of occupied private dwellings in Canada that year were owned and 34% were rented. Further, most dwellings were single detached homes (57%), and 32% were one of the following: semi-detached houses, row houses, apartments or flats in a detached duplex, apartments in a building with fewer than five storeys, and other single attached houses. Apartments of five stories or more accounted for 9% of dwellings and moveable housing¹⁴⁵ for the remaining 1%. The mix of types of housing and ownership varied by province (Table C1.2) and by Census Metropolitan Area (Table C1.3).

Rates of household victimization were higher for renters¹⁴⁶

According to the 2004 General Social Survey (GSS) on Victimization, almost one in four Canadian households reported having been a victim of a household crime.¹⁴⁷ Among the 10 provinces, Saskatchewan and Manitoba demonstrated the highest rates for household victimization (Table B1.1). Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec reported having the lowest household victimization rates.

Rates of household crimes were higher for those who rented rather than owned their homes. In 2004, the household victimization rate for rented residences was 267 incidents per 1,000 households compared to 242 per 1,000 homes that were owned (Gannon and Mihorean, 2005). Further, semi-detached, row housing and duplex housing were more likely to be the target of a household crime (323 incidents per 1,000 households) than single detached homes or apartments (247 and 213 per 1,000 households, respectively). These patterns of elevated risk were also found in the 1999 General Social Survey on Victimization (Besserer and Hendrick, 2001).

C1.9 Social capital: Social interactions and determinants, and outcomes/consequences of interactions¹⁴⁸

In recent years, a growing body of literature has emerged on the relationship between social capital and the well-being of communities (Frank, 2003). The concept of social capital can be understood as the social interactions and common norms that facilitate collective action for the benefit of individuals and the community (Woolcock, 2001; Rohe, 2004). In other words, social ties can be an important source in promoting the overall health of neighbourhoods. The absence of social capital can translate into negative consequences on a community, such as crime, lower levels of health, and poor educational achievement (Putnam, 2001).

Social capital is not evenly distributed among all communities; rather, it varies in intensity. Such factors as the length of residence, community structure, and access to formal organizations (public, non-profit, and private) can have important influences on levels of civic and social participation, which in turn, have an impact on social capital (Littell and Wynn, 1989). It is noteworthy that social capital can also carry costs to the community (Woolcock, 2001). This occurs when social networks are delinquent or criminal in nature, as is the case with delinquent peer and hate groups.

The multidimensionality of social capital can make it difficult to measure. Recently, the General Social Survey (GSS) on Social Engagement (2003) conceptualized social capital by collecting data on the dimensions or levels of social interactions, determinants affecting socialization (e.g., population characteristics), and outcomes (e.g., feelings of safety) (Franke, 2003). Results from this survey, combined with information on the census of population, form the basis of this analysis on positive social capital. In terms of information on negative social capital, the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY) allows for analysis of youths' association with delinquent peers and the impact these associations have on their own behaviour.

Social interactions and determinants

There are a number of ways in which Canadians can interact with people in their community. Respondents to the 2003 GSS were asked about three types of social interactions: informal social networks, organizational involvement, and political involvement.¹⁴⁹ They were also asked questions about their personal and housing characteristics, which can be used to examine variations in social engagement.

Four in ten Canadians know many or most of the people in their neighbourhood

Familiarity with people in one's immediate neighbourhood is indicative of the level of informal social networks in Canadian communities. According to the 2003 GSS, about nine in ten (91%) Canadians had at least some contact with people in their immediate neighbourhood¹⁵⁰. In particular, just under half (48%) of respondents said they knew a "few of the people" in the area (Schellenberg, 2004). More extensive contacts were reported by 43% of Canadians, with over one-quarter (27%) of Canadians saying that they knew most people in their neighbourhood, while another 16% saying they knew many of them. About 7% of Canadians said they knew "nobody else" in the neighbourhood.¹⁵¹

Large urban residents have fewer contacts with neighbours

Community characteristics can play a critical role in the extent of contacts between neighbours. One example of these characteristics is urban versus rural residency, which has been linked to the level of interaction between neighbours (Kremavik, 2000). When asked about their familiarity with people in their neighbourhood, GSS respondents who resided in larger communities reported fewer contacts than residents of other communities. One in six Canadians living in the largest metropolitan areas knew most of their neighbours. This compares to one in three Canadians living in municipalities with populations of less than 50,000, and one in two people in rural and small town areas.

Longer periods of residence result in greater familiarity with neighbours

The 2003 GSS confirms conventional wisdom that the duration of residence consistently influences the extent to which individuals know others in their community. For instance, after five years of living in the same community, 26% of CMA residents knew most of their neighbours. The same was true for 14% of CMA residents living in the same area for 3 to 4 years, 9% for 1-to-3 year residents and 4% of residents who had moved into the area less than a year before. The length of residency was also an important determinant in the likelihood of extensive neighbourhood contacts in non-CMA communities (Table C1.4).

These findings suggest that communities with high population turnover, or in other words, less population stability, have fewer informal neighbourhood social networks. This, in turn, may result in less social capital and may affect levels and fear of crime.

Recent immigrants less likely to know their neighbours

Closely related to length of residence is the influence of immigrant status on social contacts. Results from the 2003 GSS indicate that recent immigrants to Canada are less likely to know most of their neighbours. Specifically, 4% of recent immigrants¹⁵² knew most of their neighbours. In comparison, 12% of immigrants who arrived earlier than 1990 and 84% of Canadian-born individuals knew the majority of the people in their community. Besides length of residence, factors such as language barriers¹⁵³ and unfamiliarity with Canadian social norms and expectations may affect the ability or willingness of recent immigrants to interact with their neighbours (Kremavik, 2000).

The impact of immigrant status on social contacts is an important consideration, given that Canada continues to be a major immigrant-receiving country. A recent study using Census data suggests that visible minority immigrants settling in large cities are increasingly residing in neighbourhoods with their own ethnic group (Hou, 2004). In addition, the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants found that a large proportion of immigrants locate in the same neighbourhood as their relatives and friends (Statistics Canada, 2003i). The possible implication of these two residential patterns may be greater levels of social capital, compared to areas where residents are unfamiliar with one another's culture and language. In fact, previous research has indicated that proximity to family members can play a role in the level of interaction between individuals in a community (Kremavik, 2000). This type of social capital, however, has often been referred to as "bonding social capital", where the social networks are between similar people and are more important for "getting by". "Bridging social capital", on the other hand, which consists of linkages to authority figures, colleagues and business associates, is more useful for "getting ahead" (Putnam, 2004).

Canadians living in single detached homes most likely to know their neighbours

Previous studies on the frequency of people's contact with neighbours have noted the importance of housing design to personal interactions (Kremavik, 2000). Despite the higher density and smaller distance between people in apartment buildings and other attached dwellings (e.g., semi-detached homes), residents of single detached homes were more likely than all other residents to know most or many people in the neighbourhood, according to the 2003 GSS (52% versus 28%).¹⁵⁴ These findings on the relationship of housing structure and neighbourhood connections are similar to analysis based on the National Population Health Survey (Kremavik, 2000) and the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (Peters, 2002). According to the 1996/97 National Population Health Survey, about 82% of residents in single detached houses reported having some interaction with their neighbours, compared to 72% living in duplexes, semi-detached houses, row housing or garden homes, and 62% living in apartments. Similarly, respondents to the 1999 National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth residing in single family, semi-detached or garden homes were much more likely than those residing in duplexes or apartments to believe that their neighbours are willing to help each other (91% versus 75%), that they watch to ensure that children are safe (89% versus 72%) and that their neighbours watch out for trouble in their absence (91% versus 73%).

Data from the 2003 GSS also indicate differences between apartment dwellers and residents of other attached homes. In particular, apartment residents were less likely to know most or many people in their neighbourhood (21% versus 34%).

As stated earlier, Canada-wide, the most common type of dwelling reported to the 2001 Census was single detached homes, accounting for over half (57%) of all residences. Although representing the majority of all housing structures nationally, the proportion of the Canadian population residing in single-detached homes varies from neighbourhood to neighbourhood, city to city and even province to province (Tables C1.2 and C1.3). Variations at various geographic levels suggest regional differences in the level of social contacts between neighbours.

Eight in ten Canadians said they live in communities where neighbours help each other

Along with the number of social interactions between neighbours, researchers have pointed to the need to recognize the quality of these relationships (Woldolff, 2002; Stone et. al., 2003). According to the 2003 GSS, eight in ten Canadians said they live in a community where neighbours help each other. In terms of personal experiences, 60% of Canadians did a favour for or received a favour from a neighbour within the past month. Some examples of favours include picking up mail, watering plants, shoveling, lending tools or garden equipment, and feeding pets when neighbours go on holidays.

Six in ten Canadians involved in some form of organized group

Organizational or civic involvement is one component of an individual's social networks within a community (Stone et. al., 2003). According to the 2003 GSS, six in ten (61%) Canadians stated that they belonged to an organized group or an organization that met on a regular basis. The most common type of involvement related to sports and recreational organizations (29%), followed by unions and professional associations (25%), cultural, education or hobby groups (18%), religious affiliated groups (17%) and school or community groups (17%) (Schellenberg, 2004).

Of those Canadians who are part of an organization or group, the frequency of participation ranged from at least once a week to no participation in the last year. Generally speaking, Canadians were more likely to meet regularly. In 2003, 40% of people participated at least once a week, followed by few times a month (20%), at least once a month (18%), twice a year (15%), and not at all in the last year (6%) (Schellenberg, 2004).

Consistent with the findings from the Ethnic Diversity Study (Statistics Canada, 2003d), recent immigrants to Canada were less likely to participate in organizations or groups than those who immigrated earlier and people born in Canada. This may be due to a period of adjustment to a new country, which involves adapting to a new job and community, and for some, a new language (Statistics Canada, 2003d).

Majority of Canadians involved in political activities

Political involvement, another component of networks, can be measured by examining both "traditional" involvement (e.g., voting practices) and "unconventional" participation (e.g., signing petitions) (Barnes and Kasse, 1979). Together, these activities give a sense of Canadian's involvement in political life. Based on the 2003 GSS, a majority of Canadians voted in the most recent elections,¹⁵⁵ with 70% voting in either federal or provincial elections, and 33% voting in both.

When asked about political participation over the last year, 28% of respondents said that they signed a petition (Schellenberg, 2004). The next most common political activities involved searching for political information (26%), attending a public meeting (21%), and boycotting/choosing a product for ethical reasons (20%). Less common political activities involved contacting a newspaper or politician (13%), participating in a demonstration (6%), and volunteering for a political party (3%).

Negative social networks among youth increased risk-taking behaviour

As previously mentioned, social networks can also be negative. That is, social interactions can involve persons with delinquent and criminal belief systems, which can lead to negative social outcomes for the community, such as crime. Negative outcomes would be particularly apparent in communities with a high prevalence of negative social networks.

Data from the second cycle of National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY), which captured self-reported behaviour of youths aged 12 to 13, revealed that approximately one adolescent in seven (15%) belonged to a group that “did risky things”¹⁵⁶ (Statistics Canada, 1999). There was no difference between girls and boys. Negative social networks appear to increase deviant involvements. According to the NLSCY, youths aged 12 to 13 who belonged to a group that “did risky things” were also more likely to engage in risk-taking behaviours, such as disorderly conduct and stealing.

Outcomes/consequences of social interactions: Feelings of safety and fear of crime

Strong positive social networks can increase co-operation and resources within a community to enable people to collectively prevent and respond to issues affecting the community (Woolcock, 2001). Although the outcomes can be difficult to measure, results from the 2003 GSS on Social Engagement provide an understanding of traditional measures of community well-being, including health, stress, level of happiness, life satisfaction, coping ability, sense of belonging, trust, and feelings of safety (Franke, 2003). While the 2003 GSS on Social Engagement did not measure incidents of criminal victimization¹⁵⁷, it did measure feelings of safety from crime. Because there is an association between higher levels of personal and household victimization and high levels of dissatisfaction with overall safety from crime, as demonstrated with data from the 2004 and 1999 GSS on Victimization (Besserer and Hendrick, 2001; Ogg, 2001), information on feelings of safety from crime from the 2003 GSS on Social Engagement can be used as a proxy measure of victimization.

Eight in ten Canadians feel safe from crime while walking alone in their community in the evening or at night

The term “fear” is commonly used to describe an emotional response to an immediate threat (Ogg, 2001). Researchers, however, do not generally have access to respondents in fear provoking situations. For this reason, in the GSS, fear is understood as a perception or an attitude rather than as an emotional response to imminent danger. In this sense, fear of crime is based on feelings of safety in the community and at home.

According to the 2003 GSS on Social Engagement, eight in ten Canadians felt safe from crime while walking alone in their neighbourhood in the evening or at night.¹⁵⁸ This is similar to the findings from the 2004 General Survey on victimization, which reported that 76% of Canadians felt reasonably or very safe. Fear of crime appears to have an impact on the frequency of walking alone at night in the neighbourhood. According to the 2003 GSS, 62% who reported feeling very unsafe stated that they would walk alone more often if they felt safer.

Fear of crime can also be felt in the home. When asked if they felt worried when home alone in the evening or at night, most respondents (82%) said they were not at all worried about their safety from crime. A small proportion (16%), however, reported that they felt either very or somewhat worried about their safety from crime in this situation.

Lower levels of fear expressed by Canadians living in close-knit neighbourhoods and those involved in organizations

A descriptive analysis¹⁵⁹ of the relationship between social networks and the fear of crime shows that people who had informal social contacts with their neighbours were less likely to express fear than those who had no social contact with their neighbours, according to the 2003 GSS on Social Engagement. In particular, among those who knew most people in their neighbourhood, 89% felt reasonably or very safe from crime while walking alone at night, compared to 85% who knew many people, and 81% who knew a few. Similarly, feelings of safety when home alone in the evening or at night were also highest for people who were familiar with most of the neighbours with 87% feeling not worried at all, compared to 82% who knew few of their neighbours.

Living in a community where neighbours help each other also increased feelings of safety. This was the case for the two measures of fear of crime: walking alone in their area in the evening or at night, and being home alone during these hours. Explanations for this pattern may reside in people's perception that neighbours would possibly come to their aid if they were criminally confronted.

Examining familiarity with neighbours, coupled with the quality of these relationships, provides further insight into social networks and fear of crime. Canadians who knew most of their neighbours and felt that they could rely on neighbours for help were the most likely to feel secure walking alone in their area in the evening or at night. However, the frequency and quality of neighbourhood relationships did not seem to have the same impact on feelings of security when alone at home in the evening or at night.

Organizational involvement is related to lower levels of fear. In particular, 85% of Canadians who participated in an organization indicated high levels of safety.¹⁶⁰ The same can be said for political engagement, where 85% of Canadians who were actively involved in political activities¹⁶¹ reported low levels of fear.¹⁶²

C1.10 Perceptions of crime¹⁶³

Over half of Canadians felt that levels of crime in their neighbourhood had not changed in the last five years

Canadian's perceptions of crime levels in their neighbourhood can be influenced by many factors such as their own experiences of victimization, the physical and social conditions of one's neighbourhood and the coverage of crime events in the media. Overall, however, the majority of Canadians feel that crime in their neighbourhood had neither worsened nor improved.

According to the 2004 General Social Survey (GSS) on Victimization, 58% of Canadians believed that the level of crime in their neighborhood had not changed during the previous five years, up considerably from the 43% who expressed this same opinion in 1993. In 2004 only 30% of Canadians believed that crime in their neighbourhood had increased during the previous five years, compared to 46% in 1993. Canadians' perceptions mirror police-reported crime trends whereby the crime rate grew steadily during the 1980s, peaked in 1991, and then began falling again until 1999 where it held steady until 2002.

Six in ten Canadians felt that crime in their neighbourhood was lower than in other areas

In 2004, the majority of Canadian citizens (59%) felt that crime rates in their neighbourhood were lower than in other Canadian communities, a proportion which remained practically unchanged from both 1999 and 1993. Between 72% and 87% of residents in the four Atlantic provinces felt that crime was lower in their neighbourhood than other communities. In comparison, over half of (56%) British Columbians held this view and about 60% of residents in the other western provinces felt the same way. This may be explained by the fact that in 2004, with the exception of high rates of violent crime in Nova Scotia, the four western provinces tended to report higher rates of violent and household victimization than the Atlantic provinces.

C1.11 Gang activity and organized crime

Gang activity and organized crime

The presence of street gangs or organized crime in a community can have considerable consequences for the community in a variety of ways. Street gangs are usually highly visible within their community and use intimidation tactics through increased gang presence, and the perpetration of violent incidents (Ogrodnik, 2002). Organized crime groups, although sometimes less visible in the community compared to street gangs, also affect the community in which they operate as well as society at large by contributing to the overall rate of property and violent crime and affecting the economy at various levels.

The criminal activities by gang members and those involved in organized crime may undermine the sense of security and safety in a community and could increase levels of fear. Moreover, as discussed in a previous section on social capital, if the social cohesion of a neighbourhood is destabilized, social interactions that facilitate collective action in the community may also be weakened, thus perpetuating criminal activity and reducing the involvement of people in their community.

As presented in Section B1.5 of this report, some studies have examined the presence of organized crime in the context of specific criminal activities (Dauvergne, 2005; Wallace, 2004; Sauvé, 1999).¹⁶⁴ While it is generally accepted that organized crime exists in Canada, the full extent of its existence is unknown. Similarly, little is known, in quantitative terms, about the prevalence of gang activity in Canada.

C1.12 Hate-motivated crime

Race/ethnicity most common target

Like gang activity and organized crime, hate-motivated crimes affect not only the immediate victim, but can spread feelings of insecurity to the entire community to which the victim belongs as well as other communities and the public at large. Sentencing principles in section 718.2 of the *Criminal Code* define hate-motivated crimes as those that are “motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation or any other similar factor.”


Canada’s increasingly diverse population not only leads to a rich mosaic of cultures, religions and languages, but also the potential for an increase in social tensions which, in their most serious expression, can lead to hate-motivated crime. Recently, various studies have begun to measure the nature and extent of hate-motivated crime in Canada through victimization surveys, other general population surveys and police-reported data.

According to the 2004 General Social Survey (GSS) on Victimization, in 4% of criminal victimizations in the year prior to the survey the victim believed that the incident was motivated by hate. This rate is unchanged from 1999 (Gannon and Mihorean, 2005). Similar to findings in 1999, the 2004 GSS found that 65% of hate-motivated incidents were based on hatred of the victim’s race or ethnicity. A further 26% were believed to be motivated by hatred of the victim’s sex, followed by religion (14%) and sexual orientation (12%).

These findings are fairly consistent with the results of a recent pilot study with 12 major police forces¹⁶⁵ across the country that reported 928 hate-motivated crimes during the years 2001 and 2002 (Silver et al, 2004). The pilot survey found that incidents motivated by race/ethnicity accounted for more than half (57%) of all hate-motivated crimes reported to the 12 forces, followed by those targeting religion (43%) and sexual orientation (10%) (Figure C1.23).

Among those incidents motivated by hatred toward race/ethnicity, the largest single group targeted was Jewish people or institutions with one-quarter of the police-recorded hate-motivated crimes being anti-Jewish in nature (Figure C1.24). The second most targeted group was Blacks (17%), followed by Muslims (11%), South Asians (10%) and Gays and Lesbians (9%).

Figure C1.23
Race/ethnicity most common target of hate-motivated crime, 2001-2002¹




1. Includes data from 12 major police services: Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto, Halton Regional, Montreal, Regina, Windsor, Winnipeg, Sudbury, Ottawa, Waterloo, and the RCMP (excluding British Columbia). These data are not nationally representative.
 2. "Other motivation" refers to other similar characteristics which may be targeted for hate-motivated crime and not included in the other categories.

Note: The category Age reported less than 1% and is therefore not included in this figure.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Hate Crime Pilot Survey.

Figure C1.24
Jewish most likely target of hate-motivated crimes, 2001-2002¹



1. Includes data from 12 major police services: Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto, Halton Regional, Montreal, Regina, Windsor, Winnipeg, Sudbury, Ottawa, Waterloo, and the RCMP (excluding British Columbia). These data are not nationally representative.
2. South Asian refers to incidents targeting East Indians, Pakistani, and Sri Lankan.
3. Multi race/multi ethnicity refers to incident targeting several race/ethnicity categories, these include anti-immigrant incidents and white supremacist incidents.
4. East and Southeast Asian refer to Chinese, Filipino, Cambodian, Indonesian, Laotian, Vietnamese, Japanese, and Korean.
5. Arab/ West Asian refers to incidents targeting Arabs as well as Afghans, Iranians, Iraqis.

Note: Totals may not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Hate Crime Pilot Survey.

The types of offences among those that were motivated by hate varied depending on the group being targeted. Overall, the most common types of hate-motivated offences involved mischief or vandalism (29%), assault (25%), uttering threats (20%) and hate propaganda (13%). Hate-motivated crimes based on race/ethnicity were mostly crimes against the person (53%), including assault, uttering threats, criminal harassment and robbery. Where religion was the basis for the hate-motivated crime, 38% of incidents were property-related, 36% were violent and a further 26% fell under 'other' criminal violations, in particular hate propaganda.

Victims who were the target of a hate-motivated crime because of their sexual orientation were much more likely to experience crimes against the person (65%). Most of these victims were assaulted (63%) or threatened (21%). This confirms previous research that suggests that anti-gay/lesbian crimes tend to be more violent than other hate-motivated offences (Nelson and Kiefl, 1995). In fact, according to the pilot survey, gay and lesbian victims of hate-motivated crime were almost twice as likely as other victims of hate-motivated crime to suffer an injury as a result of the incident (46% versus 25%).


Blacks, South Asians and East and Southeast Asians most worried about being the target of a hate-motivated crime

The extent to which people worry about being the target of a hate-motivated crime is an important indicator of how well a community or group will integrate into and fully participate in society. In 2002, the Ethnic Diversity Survey asked approximately 42,000 people about their level of worry about being the victim of a hate-motivated crime

based on their ethno-cultural identity. Results from the survey suggest that only 5% of Canadians said that they were worried or very worried about becoming the victim of crime motivated by hatred, bias or prejudice against their ethno-cultural identity (Silver et al, 2004). However, some groups within the general population expressed greater concern about being targeted.

Overall, visible minority Canadians were three times more likely to be worried about being the target of a hate-motivated crime than non-visible minorities (11% versus 4%). Specifically, rates of worry were highest among Blacks (15%), South Asians (13%) and East and Southeast Asians (10%) (Figure C1.25). In addition, while immigrants, especially recent arriving immigrants, tended to be more worried than individuals who were Canadian born, levels of worry were greatest among immigrants who were also visible minorities. Just over one in ten (12%) immigrants who were visible minorities were worried compared to 6% of immigrants who were non-visible minorities.

Figure C1.25
Blacks most worried among visible minority groups about being targeted for an ethno-cultural hate-motivated crime



^E use with caution

1. South Asian includes East Indians, Pakistani, and Sri Lankan.
2. Other race/ethnicity includes Latin American and visible minorities not included elsewhere.
3. East and Southeast Asian includes Chinese, Filipino, Cambodian, Indonesian, Laotian, Vietnamese, Korean and Japanese.
4. Arab/West Asian includes Afghans, Iranians, Iraqis.

Note: Except for differences between Blacks and Arab/West Asians, differences among visible minority groups are not statistically significant.

Source: Statistics Canada, Ethnic Diversity Survey, 2002.

The survey also found that people from certain religious groups were more worried about being the target of a hate-motivated crime. This was particularly evident among those of Hindu (19%), Jewish (11%) and Muslim (10%) faiths.

C2 Family

Family is a critical agent of informal social control. Parents, siblings and extended family exert a powerful and important influence on the development of children and youth. Family structure and stability, family income, conflict and violence in the home, parental substance use or abuse, and presence of extended family are among the family factors that may influence one's risk of offending, being victimized or engaging in deviant or delinquent behaviour.


C2.1 Family structure¹⁶⁶

Common-law unions and lone-parent families increasing

In recent decades, Canada has seen significant changes in the structure of families where the proportion of "traditional families" (i.e., those consisting of a mother, a father and children) has declined. While families consisting of married couples either with or without children are still the most common, other kinds of families are accounting for a greater share of family types (Figure C2.1). According to the 2001 Census of the population, there were 8,371,020 families of which the majority (70%) were families consisting of married couples with or without children, compared to 77% in 1991. Families characterized by couples in common-law unions accounted for 14% of census families, and lone-parent families for 16% (compared to 10% and 13%, respectively, in 1991). Eight in ten lone-parent families were headed by women.

Figure C2.1

Families headed by married couples still account for the majority of families¹, but other types of families are growing




1. A Census family is a married or common-law couple living together, with or without never-married sons or daughters; or a lone-parent living with at least one never-married son or daughter. Census families include those living in private dwellings and exclude families living in institutions or other types of collective dwellings.

Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division, Census of Population.

Increase in children living with parents in common-law union

With a change in family structure, the rate of children under the age of 15 living with parents in common-law unions and in lone-parent families is increasing. In 1981, about 3% of children under 15 years old lived in common-law families, compared to 13% in 2001 (Figure C2.2). The growing trend to have children in common-law relationships is especially prominent in Quebec where, in 2001, almost three in ten (29%) children under the age 15 lived with common-law parents, compared to only 8% in the rest of Canada.

Figure C2.2
Percentage of children living with parents in common-law unions and within lone-parent families is increasing



* Includes about 1% of children with other living arrangements.
 Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division, Census of Population.

Common-law unions at greater risk of separation and spousal violence than legally married unions

Studies have shown that common-law unions are at greater risk of separation and spousal violence than legally married unions. For instance, according to the 2001 General Social Survey (GSS) on Family, women whose first union was common-law were twice as likely to experience separation as those whose first union was marriage (Statistics Canada, 2002c). Further, the 2004 GSS on Victimization shows that risk of spousal violence is three times higher in common-law relationships than in marital unions (Mihorean, 2005), a difference that was also identified through the 1999 GSS on Victimization (Pottie Bunge, 2000). In terms of the impact on children, research has shown that children who experience separation or divorce are more likely to experience separation as adults (Statistics Canada, 2002d). Moreover, studies have demonstrated that children who witness violence in their home are more likely to exhibit aggressive behaviour (Hotton, 2003) and become either abusers or victims of spousal violence later in life (Johnson, 1996).

Increase in children living in lone-parent families

The rate of children under age 15 living in lone-parent families has also increased over the past two decades and there are more children living in this type of family than in

families headed by common-law couples. In 2001, 19% of children lived with only one parent compared to 13% in 1981 (Figure C2.2). As indicated earlier in this section, about eight in ten of these families were headed by mothers. The rise in the number of lone-parent families, especially those headed by women, has led to a rise in the number of children living in low-income households as these households have the highest incidence of low-income (Statistics Canada, 2000) (Figure C1.15). These children, in turn, are not only at risk of financial deprivation, but also the disruption, stress and instability that often follows separation and divorce.

Step-families are increasing

With the dissolution of married and common-law unions, Canada is seeing an increasing number of couples with children entering into new unions. In 2001, there were 503,100 step-families in Canada, compared to 430,500 in 1995 (Statistics Canada, 2002c). In other words, step-families accounted for 12% of all Canadian couples with children in 2001, compared to 10% in 1995. This phenomenon has also led to an increased number of children living in step-families. The 1998/99 National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth estimated that about 7% of children under the age of 15 were living in a step-family that year (Statistics Canada, 2003j). The majority of children living in step-families are in fact part of a blended family where children are from one or more previous unions, or both step and biological children from the current union live in the same household.

Increase in seniors living with their adult children

Another major shift that has occurred in more recent years is the growth in the number of seniors living with their adult children, especially older women. In 2001, 12% of senior women lived with their children, up from 9% in 1981 (Statistics Canada, 2003j). This increase has been the result of changes in how Canada cares for its elderly. Community-based care, as opposed to institutional care, has become the preferred method of caring for older Canadians, and much of this has fallen to family members and friends (Frederick and East, 1999). While having grandparents live in the family household provides the presence of extended family in the home, research has shown that meeting the demands of caring for both elderly parents and children can cause psychological, emotional and financial stress (Cranswick, 2003; Frederick and East, 1999). This, in turn, can contribute to an increased risk of senior abuse (Brzozowski, 2004a).


C2.2 Divorce

Number of divorces increased slightly¹⁶⁷

While the majority of children come through divorce and parental separation with little negative impact, studies have found that some children are harmed by the experience and that the effects can last well into adulthood (Department of Justice Canada, 2002). Research has found that parental conflict has the most notable impact on children, even more so than strained relationships with their parents and economic hardship (Bernardini and Jenkins, 2002). Potential outcomes of parental conflict are poor school achievement, behavioral and psychological problems and reduced social skills (Department of Justice, 1997; Stewart 2001; Bernardini and Jenkins, 2002).

The 70,828 divorces in Canada in 2003 marked the first increase (+1%) since 2000 (Statistics Canada, 2005e). While the number of divorces had fallen in both 2001 and 2002, they had been on the rise between 1998 and 2000. Despite the 1% increase in 2003, the number of divorces recorded that year was about 26% below the all time high of about 96,000 divorces in 1987 (Figure C2.3).

Figure C2.3
Number of marriages and divorces in Canada, 1921 to 2002



Source: Statistics Canada, Vital Statistics Division, Divorce Database.

The slight increase in the national number of divorces in 2003 was driven by a 5.1 % growth in divorces in Ontario and a 1.4% increase in Quebec (Statistics Canada, 2005e). Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan also experienced increases. The remaining provinces all experienced declines, with Newfoundland and Labrador recording the largest decrease (-21.4%).

According to 2003 data, it is estimated that by the 30th wedding anniversary, 38.3 per 100 marriages will end in divorce. This rate varied considerably across the country. Among the provinces, Quebec had the highest rate of divorce at 49.7 per 100 marriages, followed by Alberta (40.0) and British Columbia (39.8). Newfoundland and Labrador (17.1), Prince Edward Island (27.3) and New Brunswick (27.6) recorded the lowest rates of divorce.

Children are witnessing separation and divorce at increasingly younger ages

While the average age of men and women divorcing is becoming older (Statistics Canada, 2004b), research has shown that children of divorced or separated parents are becoming increasingly younger (Department of Justice Canada, 2002). About 25% of children born between 1961 and 1963 were either born to a single mother or had experienced the marital breakdown of their parents by the age of 20. Ten years later, among children born between 1971 and 1973, 25% experienced the same phenomenon by the age of 15. This pattern continued with children born between 1983 and 1984 where one-quarter were either born to a single mother or had experienced parental separation by the age of 10.

C2.3 Child custody and support

Joint custody increases as sole custody for mothers declines

In 2002, custody of dependants was granted for children under the age of 18 in about 28% of divorces (Statistics Canada, 2004b).¹⁶⁸ That year, there were approximately 35,000 dependants for which custody was decided by the courts and data show that the likelihood of mothers receiving custody is declining. Slightly less than one-half of

these children were ordered to reside with their mother, compared to three-quarters in 1988. The proportion of dependents where joint custody is ordered has been increasing over the past 16 years and was just over 40% in 2002.

Children, particularly young children, are still more likely to reside with their mother upon separation

According to 1994/95 data from the National Longitudinal Survey on Children and Youth, in just under one-half (48%) of all cases¹⁶⁹, parents had a court order or were in the process of obtaining a court order for custodial arrangements of their children (Marcil-Gratton and Le Bourdais, 1999). Data also reveal that custodial arrangements vary based on the age of the children. For example, almost 80% of children younger than 12 years of age were placed with their mother, while about 7% were placed in their father's care and the remaining 13% were in shared custody arrangements. As children become older, custody arrangements change where older children are more likely to either be placed with their father or in a joint custody arrangement.

However, despite court orders, further analysis of the National Longitudinal Survey on Children and Youth reveals that just over 80% of children resided with their mother at time of separation. In cases where shared custody was ordered (13%), three-quarters of these children were still more likely to live with their mothers and only 15% lived with their fathers. In fact, in just 9% of cases, custody was actually shared between parents.

Access to children varies depending on the type of union at separation

Access to children for the non-custodial parent varies depending on whether parents are married or in a common-law union at time of separation. For example, children of common-law parents are more likely to live solely with their mothers than are children of married couples (91% versus 83%) (Department of Justice Canada, 2000). Also, children of common-law parents are about two times more likely than children of married parents to never visit their father at the time of separation (21% versus 11%). Finally, joint custody arrangements are almost three times more likely to occur between married couples who are separating than between couples who lived in a common-law relationship (8% versus 3%).

No child support agreement for one-third of children

According to the 1994/95 National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth, there was no support agreement in place for one-third of children whose parents had separated (Marcil-Gratton and LeBourdais, 1999). Rates were slightly higher among children of separated common-law parents (42%) than of married parents who were separated (36%). Children whose parents were divorced at the time of survey were far less likely to be without a child support agreement (17%).

Results further found that there is a connection between the regularity of child support payments, the type of child support arrangement and the frequency of fathers maintaining contact with their children (Marcil-Gratton and LeBourdais, 1999). First, children of parents who arrived at a private support payment agreement were more likely to receive regular payments than were children of parents who were under support arrangement ordered by the court (66% versus 43%) (Department of Justice Canada, 2002). Second, almost one-half (48%) of children living with their mother and receiving regular payments from their father saw their father regularly every week, and only 7% never saw their father. In comparison, among children whose fathers had not provided child support payments in the last six months, only 15% of children saw their fathers weekly and 28% never saw him.

Failure to make child support payments contributes significantly to child poverty. During the 1980s and 1990s maintenance enforcement programs were created in each of the provinces and territories to enforce the payment of child and spousal support. It has been estimated that less than one-half of all support cases are registered to a maintenance enforcement program (Pronovost, 2004) since these programs typically deal with the most difficult cases. Often, those who enter the program are already in arrears or there has been difficulty collecting payments.

According to the 2003/04 Maintenance Enforcement Survey¹⁷⁰ the vast majority of cases registered with a program involve a support amount for children, ranging from 73% of cases in Ontario to 97% in British Columbia.¹⁷¹ In addition, it appears that more cases are entering into maintenance enforcement programs. For example, of those jurisdictions participating in the survey, results show that between March 2003 and March 2004 the number of cases enrolled increased by 2% in Ontario and Saskatchewan, by 4% in Quebec and by 7% in Prince Edward Island. In British Columbia the caseload remained relatively stable, while Alberta saw a decrease of 3% (Pronovost, 2004).

C2.4 Size of households

Households¹⁷² becoming smaller

Research has suggested that the number of people living in a household can have an impact on crime and victimization. It has been argued that adults who live alone face greater risks of personal and household victimization because of the lack of guardianship over themselves and their property (Cohen and Felson, 1979; Miethe and Meier, 1990). However, results from the 2004 General Social Survey on Victimization show that the rate of household victimization among homes with one occupant was 45% lower than the rate among households with four or more members (178 incidents per 1,000 households versus 323 per 1,000 households). Among the one-member households, about half were occupied by someone aged 55 and over. This may explain the lower rates of household victimization as individuals in this age bracket are likely to be retired and therefore their property is less likely to be unattended during the day. Further, research has confirmed that rates of household and personal victimization are consistently lower among older age groups (Statistics Canada, 2001).

Over the last two decades, Canadian households have become smaller. In 2001, the average number of persons in households was 2.6 compared to 2.9 in 1981. With the exception of Nunavut, where the average number of people living in a household was 3.7, all other provinces and territories ranged between 2.4 and 2.9 persons per household (Census 2001, Statistics Canada). Given the decline in the average size of households, it is not surprising that the proportion of one and two-person households in Canada had increased to 13%, compared to 9% in 1981.

C2.5 Violence in the family

Family violence includes physical and sexual violence against one family member by another family member. What was once a hidden problem is now recognized as an issue that not only affects the individual, but the family as a whole and the broader community.


Research has shown that children who grow up in a house where there is violence are more likely to exhibit aggressive behaviour during childhood and become aggressors or victims of violence later in life (Rodgers 1994; Dauvergne and Johnson 2001; Hotton, 2003). In order to break the cycle of violence and reduce the extent of family violence in Canada, a number of programs, services and policies have been developed over the

past three decades to assist victims directly and to address issues of family violence, including spousal violence, child abuse and violence against older Canadians.

Slight decrease in spousal violence reported by women

Spousal violence against both women and men residing in the ten provinces was measured by Statistics Canada's General Social Survey on Victimization in 1999 and 2004.¹⁷³ Overall, rates reported in 2004 were unchanged from 1999. In both years, 7% of Canadians aged 15 years and older who were married or living in a common-law relationship within the five years prior to the survey reported experiencing spousal violence in either a current or previous relationship. However, women reported a slight, yet statistically significant decline from 8% in 1999 to 7% in 2004 (Figure C2.4). The decrease observed among men (7% versus 6%) was not statistically significant. Overall, it is estimated that 653,000 women and 546,000 men were either physically or sexually assaulted by their current or previous partner at some point during the five years prior to the 2004 survey.

Figure C2.4
Spousal violence trends, 5-year rates, 1999 and 2004¹



1. Includes common-law partners. Excludes people who refused to state their marital status.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 1999 and 2004.

Rates of spousal violence among previous relationships dropped considerably

While violence in current unions remained virtually unchanged for men and women from 1999 to 2004, rates of spousal violence for previous relationships have dropped considerably. In 1999, 4% of both women and men in current relationships reported spousal violence by their partner, a rate which remained stable in 2004 (Figure C2.4). However, among those who reported being in a previous relationship within the five years prior to the survey, rates of spousal violence experienced by both women and men while in those relationships fell markedly: women reported a decrease from 28% in 1999 to 21% in 2004, and rates for men fell from 22% to 16% (Figure C2.4).


Women continued to experience more serious violence than men

Although five-year rates of self-reported spousal violence were similar among women and men in 2004, women reported more serious forms of violence, a pattern that was also found in 1999 (Pottie Bunge, 2000). In 2004, for both women and men, the most common types of violence were threats of being hit with something, having something thrown at them that could hurt them, being pushed, grabbed or shoved or being slapped (Mihorean, 2005). Women, however, were more likely than men to report more serious forms of violence such as being beaten, choked or threatened with or had a gun or knife used against them by their partner (25% versus 15%). Further, in 2004, 44% of female victims of spousal violence reported that the violence resulted in injury compared to 18% of male victims of spousal violence.

Rate of spousal violence continued to be higher in western Canada

In 2004, five-year rates of spousal violence varied across the country ranging from 6% to 10% for women and 4% to 8% for men (Figure C2.5).¹⁷⁴ Overall, rates across the provinces were unchanged from 1999 to 2004. Similar to findings in 1999, women residing in Alberta (10%), Saskatchewan (9%) and British Columbia (9%) were those most likely to report spousal violence (Mihorean, 2005; Pottie Bunge, 2000). Rates were lowest among women living in Newfoundland and Labrador (6%), New Brunswick (6%) and Quebec (6%).

Figure C2.5
Rates of spousal violence highest in the West, past 5 years, 2004¹



^E use with caution

^F too small to produce reliable estimates

¹ Excludes people who refused to state their marital status.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey on Victimization, 2004.

Certain populations more vulnerable to spousal violence

As in 1999, the 2004 GSS data suggest that certain factors elevate one's risk of spousal violence. In 2004, higher rates of spousal violence were reported by those who are young, who live in a common-law union, who have been in a relationship for three years or less, and whose partner is considered a heavy drinker (meaning who consumes five or more drinks on five or more occasions in a one-month period) (Mihorean, 2005). In addition, narrative information from the Homicide Survey suggests that the risk of lethal violence for young women is highest during the first two months of separation (Hotton, 2002).

Female victims were more likely than male victims to report spousal violence to police

As one of several initiatives to improve justice responses to family violence, the 1980s saw the implementation of mandatory charging policies across the country. It was hoped that these procedures would also lead to an increased willingness of women to contact the police. Despite the implementation of such policies, less than one-third (28%) of those who reported experiencing at least one incident of spousal violence in the five years prior to the 2004 GSS stated that the police had found out about the incident. This figure is virtually unchanged from 1999 (27%). However, data from the 2002 Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting Survey showed that once incidents were brought to the attention of the police, approximately 79% were cleared by charge (Brzozowski, 2004b). In fact, this percentage is an increase of eight percentage points over 1999. According to the 2004 GSS, incidents involving women as victims were much more likely than incidents involving men to come to the attention of police (36% versus 17%).¹⁷⁵

Child abuse

Abuse and neglect can negatively affect a child's development and influence the risk of delinquency. Despite this understanding, there is no comprehensive national data on the nature and extent of child abuse in Canada. What is known is the number of incidents that come to the attention of the police through the Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting Survey, the number of cases of child maltreatment reported by child welfare workers through the Canadian Incidence Study of Reported Child Abuse and Neglect,¹⁷⁶ and the extent to which children witness violence in the home and its impact on children.

Girls who were victims of physical and sexual assaults were more likely than their male counterparts to have been victimized by a family member


Research has shown that the vast majority of those who harm children are known to the child (Beattie, 2005; AuCoin 2005b; Trocmé and Wolfe 2001). According to a subset of 122 police agencies reporting to the Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR2) Survey in 2003, children and youth (under 18 years of age) who were victims of physical or sexual assaults were most commonly victimized by friends or acquaintances (49%) and family members (23%). Further, police data show that proportions who were assaulted¹⁷⁷ by an acquaintance were about the same for male (48%) and female victims (50%), but, compared to males, a higher proportion of female victims were assaulted by family members (30% versus 18%) (Figure C2.6). In 2003, parents were the perpetrators in 70% of physical assaults and 40% of sexual assaults against children that involved a family member as the accused.

Police-reported data show that as children get older and the social networks are broadened, victimization by non-family members becomes more prevalent. However, the data also suggest that rates of family-related physical assaults increases with age, particularly for teenage girls (Beattie, 2005). Rates of sexual assault by family members were highest for teenage girls and young boys.

According to the UCR2 Trend Database, family-related assaults against children and youth decreased slightly in 2003. However, overall between 1998 and 2003, the rate of sexual assaults by a family member increased by 14% (Table C2.1), whereas the rate of sexual assaults by non-family members increased just 1%. Rates of physical assault against children and youth by a family member during this same 5-year period grew 6% and were unchanged for children physically assaulted by non-family members.

Figure C2.6

Females under 18 years old are more likely than males to be victimized by a family member, 2003^{1,2,3}



1. Excludes incidents where the sex and / or the age of the victim is unknown.
2. Data are not nationally representative. Based on data from 122 police departments representing 61% of the national volume of crime in 2003.
3. Violent victimization includes sexual assault, sexual assault with a weapon, aggravated sexual assault and the 'other sexual crimes' category, common assault, major assault, unlawfully causing bodily harm, discharge firearm with intent, criminal negligence causing bodily harm and other assaults.
4. Family includes spouse, ex-spouse, parent, child, sibling, and extended family.

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR2) Survey.

Out-of-home placements due to abuse and neglect

It is the responsibility of provincial and territorial governments to protect children from abuse and neglect and each has its own legislation to provide such protection. Although legislation, policies and protocols may differ from one jurisdiction to another, it is generally within the mandate of all child welfare agencies to remove a child from his or her home on the grounds of child abuse, maltreatment or neglect and place that child in alternate care (Secretariat to the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Working Group on Child and Family Services Information, 2002). According to the Child Incidence Study, approximately 8% of child maltreatment cases in 1998 resulted in a child being placed in child welfare care (Trocmé et al, 2001). As of March 31, 2001, the most recent year for which data are available, there were about 47,600, children in care across all jurisdictions, excluding Quebec and Nunavut.¹⁷⁸ This figure represents about a 6% increase from March 31, 1999 when the same jurisdictions reported almost 43,000 children in care.¹⁷⁹

Senior abuse


There has been a shift in the way in which Canadians are caring for their elderly. As demonstrated earlier in the section on *Family Structure*, the increase in the rate of seniors residing with adult children suggests that what used to once be a responsibility of the state is now becoming more a family responsibility (Frederick and East, 1999). This shift in responsibility has added pressures to many families who are now juggling working, raising children and caring for aging parents. This additional stress can potentially place seniors living in this environment at an increased risk of abuse.

Both victimization surveys and police-reported data show that persons aged 65 and older are those least likely to be victims of a crime (Gannon and Mihorean, 2005; AuCoin, 2005c). Police-reported data for a non-representative sample of 122 police services in 2003 suggest that when they are victimized, older adults are much less likely to be victimized by family members than by someone other than family (29% versus 71%). Among elderly people who were victims of violent crime perpetrated by a family member, 33% were victimized by adult children and 29% by a current or previous spouse (Figure C2.7).

According to data from 71 police departments who have consistently reported to the Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR2) Survey between 1998 and 2003 there has been a 23% increase in the overall rate of family violence against older Canadians (21% increase for females and 23% increase for males) (Figure C2.8). Between these two years, rates moved from 34 to 42 victims per 100,000 seniors aged 65 and older. This increase largely occurred between 1998 and 2000, followed by two years of relative stability. In 2003, there was a 10% decrease in the rate of family violence against those aged 65 and older.

Figure C2.7

Senior victims of violence by family members were most frequently victimized by adult children, 2003




1. Excludes incidents where the sex and/or the age of the victim is unknown.
2. Data are not nationally representative. Based on data from 122 police departments representing 61% of the national volume of crime in 2003.
3. Violent victimization includes violations causing death, attempting the commission of a capital crime, sexual assaults, assaults, violations resulting in the deprivation of freedom, and other violations involving violence or the threat of violence. Sexual assault includes sexual assault, sexual assault with a weapon, aggravated sexual assault and the 'other sexual crimes' category.

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR2) Survey.

Figure C2.8

Rate of family violence against seniors as reported to a subset of police departments still higher than five years ago^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5}



1. Excludes incidents where the sex and/or the age of the victim was unknown.
2. Violent crime includes violations causing death, attempting the commission of a capital crime, sexual assaults, assaults, violations resulting in the deprivation of freedom, and other violations involving violence or the threat of violence
3. Data are not nationally representative. Based on data from 71 police departments active as of December 31, 2003 representing 46% of the national volume of crime in 2003.
4. Rate per 100,000 population aged 65 and older, based on estimates provided by Demography Division, Statistics Canada.
5. Family includes spouse, ex-spouse, parent, sibling and extended family.


Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR2) Trend Database.

The role of alcohol in family violence

Research has shown that the consumption of alcohol elevates one’s risk of spousal violence (Johnson, 1996; Pottie Bunge, 2000). According to the 2004 GSS on Victimization, the risk of spousal violence increased six fold if their partner was considered a heavy drinker, meaning he or she consumed five or more drinks on five or more occasions in a given month (Figure C2.9).

Drinking has also been associated with various forms of child maltreatment and abuse. In the Canadian Incidence Study (CIS) of Child Maltreatment, Trocmé and Wolfe (2001) found that certain characteristics of caregiver functioning and certain family stressors were quite common across all cases of child maltreatment. Among the most common characteristics was alcohol and drug abuse, which were present in 40% of caregivers. Other factors that were common among caregivers were a history of abuse during childhood (38%), spousal violence (33%), mental health problems and custody disputes (9%, each). Moreover, in about one-third of families where child maltreatment was present, the family lacked forms of support.

Figure C2.9
Alcohol abuse elevates risk of spousal violence, 2004¹



^E use with caution

1. Includes common-law partners. Excludes people who refused to state their marital status.
2. Heavy drinker is defined as consuming five or more drinks on one occasion, five or more times per month.
3. Moderate drinker is defined as consuming five or more drinks on one occasion one to four times per month.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey on Victimization, 2004.

The role of substance abuse in child maltreatment is complicated. According to the CIS, it was found that caregivers who abused alcohol or drugs were also more likely than those who did not abuse substances to have experienced childhood abuse and to have mental and physical health problems, less education, lower income and more unsafe and temporary housing (Wekerle, C. et al., 2004). When these factors and the age and sex of the child are controlled, significant relationships emerged between caregiver substance abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse and neglect. Specifically, the risk of neglect increased by 155% and the risk of emotional abuse by 61% when substance abuse was present, while the risk of sexual abuse actually decreased by 65%¹⁸⁰ (Wekerle, C. et al., 2004). No correlations were found between substance abuse and physical abuse.

C3 Individual

The unique characteristics of individuals may place them at greater risk of engaging in delinquent or criminal behaviour, or being victimized. Some factors, such as Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD), occur at the prenatal stages of development. Other individual factors, such as literacy and skill development, can be a result of individuals' innate cognitive abilities but can also be affected by external factors, such as family, peers, teachers, socio-economic status and resources in the community. An individual's emotional well-being, such as their self-esteem and mental health, may also influence the likelihood of substance abuse, or the risk of involvement in crime as an offender or a victim.


Moreover, an individual's lifestyle can influence their exposure to situations that place them at risk of victimization and offending, such as situations where there is an absence of protection and guardianship. Victimization or witnessing violence may also influence the likelihood of involvement in crime as an offender (Fitzgerald, 2004; Hotton, 2003). Such involvement could be a consequence of either exposure to norms and practices that are learned in an environment which supports law breaking or deviant behaviour, or a consequence of a harmful experience that affects one's emotional well-being and chances of success.

Each of the characteristics of individuals discussed in this section has been identified in the research literature as useful and salient factors in explaining offending behaviour and risk of victimization. However, it should be noted that these factors frequently do not occur or act in isolation from one another, but are often interlinked.

C3.1 Education¹⁸¹

The opportunity to achieve success in the labour market through legitimate means increases when a higher level of education is obtained. Education improves earning capabilities and lowers the risk of unemployment (Green and Riddell, 2001). For example, Figure C3.1 demonstrates that, regardless of age, those with university education generate higher incomes on average and have greater earning potential than those with other levels of education. A higher level of education also increases the social integration of the individual with the community and employment networks. This integration helps to reduce the likelihood that an individual will jeopardize their reputation or chances for success in the future by engaging in law-breaking behaviour.

Figure C3.1
Average employment income and earning potential higher among university graduates




Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division, 2001 Census of Population.

Post-secondary education is increasing, particularly among women

Overall, according to the 2001 Census of the Population, nearly 47% of Canadians aged 25 to 64 years did not have more than a high school education while almost 18% of Canadians in the same age bracket had a college diploma or certificate and 23% had a university degree. In recent years, Canadians are obtaining higher levels of education and young people in Canada, especially young women, are largely responsible for this increase. In 2001, six in ten Canadians aged 25 to 34 had qualifications beyond high school (Figure C3.2), compared to half in 1996. The proportion of university graduates among adult women jumped from 14% in 1991 to 20% in 2001.

Figure C3.2
Canadians are attaining higher levels of schooling



Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division, 2001 Census of Population.

Issues with school are the main reasons teenagers drop out of high school

According to data from the 2002 Youth in Transition Survey on the extent and nature of dropping out of high school, approximately 3% of 17-year-old students who were first interviewed at age 15 had left high school without a diploma (McMullen, 2005).¹⁸² The main reasons most frequently cited for dropping out of school were school-related reasons such as being bored with school, problems with school work or with teachers, or being 'kicked out of school' (44%). Work-related reasons, such as wanting or having to work, were the second most frequently cited main reasons for leaving school (20%). This was followed by personal or family-related reasons (9%), which includes health reasons, pregnancy/caring for own child and problems at home.¹⁸³ The survey also found that lower scores in reading literacy, lower household incomes, lower reported marks in school and a lower expectation for high school completion were also among factors associated with 15-year-olds leaving school by the age of 17. Other contributing factors to a student's decision to drop out of school included lower positive self-perception, low feelings of self-control and low self-confidence.

Peers also played an important role in a student's decision to leave school. Dropouts were more likely to have engaged in negative behaviour prior to leaving school and were more likely to have friends who did so as well. However, the survey also showed that 14% of students who had been dropouts in December 1999 had returned to high school by the ages of 20 to 22.

High school drop out rates declined over the 1990s nationally and across all provinces

High school drop out rates have been steadily decreasing since the 1990s. According to comparable data from the School Leavers Survey and the Youth in Transition Survey, the high school dropout rate for 20-year-olds was 12% in 1999, compared to 18% in 1991 (Bowlby and McMullen, 2002). High school dropout rates had also declined across all the provinces (Table C3.1), with the largest decreases occurring in New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia. Dropout rates for both men and women fell during the 1990s. Rates were higher for men (14.7%) than for women (9.2%), but the decline has been greater for men since 1991 when 22% of men aged 20 years old had dropped out of high school, as had 14% of women.

C3.2 Literacy

As is the case with education, having strong basic skills are closely linked to the probability of having a job and access to training opportunities. Individuals with weak basic skills are more likely to be unemployed or, if employed, to be in low-paying jobs or jobs that offer poor hours or working conditions (McMullen, 2004; Green and Riddell, 2001). Further, some research has shown that poor literacy skills for men and poor numeracy skills for women increase the likelihood of offending, and that offenders who improved their literacy and numeracy skills had a lower readmission to prison (Parsons, 2002; Porporino and Robinson, 1992). Overall, research suggests that literacy levels of incarcerated offenders are significantly lower than those of the general population (Parsons, 2002).

Almost six in ten Canadians aged 16 to 65 meet most everyday reading requirements

According to results of the 2003 Adult Literacy and Life Skills Survey, about 58% of Canadians aged 16 to 65 are able to meet most everyday reading requirements, meaning they had the knowledge and skills needed to understand and use information from texts such as editorials, newspapers, brochures and instruction manuals (Desjardins

et al., 2005). This proportion remained unchanged from 1994 when literacy was first measured in Canada through the International Adult Literacy Survey.

While the proportion of Canadians who scored at the lowest performance level for this task declined slightly from 17% in 1994 to 15% in 2003, this still means that over three million people aged 16 to 65 years of age were unable to perform simple reading tasks such as locating one piece of information in a text.


Literacy scores are higher among younger Canadians compared to older age groups

Younger Canadians generally scored higher in their literacy skills than older Canadians. When measuring document literacy, meaning the knowledge and skills required to locate and use information contained in various formats such as job applications, payroll forms, transportation schedules, maps, tables and charts, 10% of Canadians aged 16 to 25 years obtained the lowest score in performing this task, compared to 22% of adults aged 46 to 65 years (Figure C3.3).¹⁸⁴ In terms of factors that can influence high literacy scores among young Canadians, the 2003 Adult Literacy and Life Skills Survey found that the parents' level of education had a significant impact on the literacy scores of their children (Desjardins et. al., 2005).

While Canadians' literacy levels rank above-average internationally in most cases, individuals whose literacy is considered poor or low may feel restricted in their opportunity to learn or to obtain a high level of education and individual economic success. This is especially true for immigrants and for individuals from a more disadvantaged socio-economic background (Ferrer et. al., 2004).

Figure C3.3

Young Canadians have higher levels of document literacy than older age groups, 2004



1. Skills were rated on a continuous scale of 0 to 500 points and were reported on a basis of five cognitive levels, with level 1 containing respondents displaying the lowest level of ability and levels 4 and 5 containing those with the highest level of ability (due to lack of respondents scoring level 5, levels 4 and 5 have been grouped together).

Source: Statistics Canada and the Organization for Economic Social Co-operation and Development, Adult Literacy and Life Skills Survey, 2003.

C3.3 Learning disabilities

The presence of a learning disability, such as attention problems, hyperactivity or dyslexia, may play a role in the risk of criminal offending. Research suggests that learning disabilities may lead to a variety of emotional and educational problems including poor literacy, low self-esteem, frustration and behavioural problems. While evidence of a relationship between learning disabilities and criminality is inconclusive, it is generally accepted that learning disabilities, mediated through poor literacy, a lower education, and other factors such as cognitive problems, could lead to criminality (Brier, 1994; Stevens, 2001).

Due to different diagnostic procedures, definitions and sampling methods, the prevalence of learning disabilities among the adult population can range from 2% to 10%.¹⁸⁵ With respect to children, Statistics Canada's 2001 Participation Activities and Limitations Survey found that 2.6% of children aged 5 to 14 were identified as having a learning disability and that two-thirds of these children were boys (Cossette and Duclos, 2001). School principals interviewed in Statistics Canada's 1994/95 National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth reported an average of 12% of students in their schools as having a learning disability (Lipps and Frank, 1997). Further, learning disabilities were reported as the most common reason for children receiving remedial education (51%). While national data on the rate of learning disabilities among the Canadian offender population are not available, some research has estimated the rate to range from 7% to 41% (Bell et al., 1984; Moke et al., 1986).

C3.4 Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder

Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) is a form of brain damage caused by the mother's use of alcohol during pregnancy. Children born with FASD typically have facial-cranial abnormalities, central nervous system dysfunction and experience pre- and post-natal delays (Health Canada, 2003). This will often result in a variety of problems such as cognitive and behavioural problems, learning disabilities and in some cases, a lowered IQ. Research on FASD suggests that a variety of secondary effects may also be common, including frustration, mental health problems, substance abuse and an increased risk of participation in law-breaking behaviours and of victimization (Streissguth, 2001; Boland et al., 1998). In 2003, Health Canada reported that FASD is the leading cause of developmental disability among Canadian children (Health Canada, 2003).

Research on the relationship between FASD and delinquency, while inconclusive, suggests that individuals with FASD may progress along the same developmental course as those who experience learning disabilities, poor school achievement, and other disorders such as attention deficit, with and without hyperactivity (Boland et al., 1998). Although individuals may have other reasons for their involvement with crime, FASD could increase the likelihood of offending, especially if other disabilities are present (Mitten, 2004). The cognitive, behavioural and adaptive problems associated with FASD could also increase one's vulnerability to criminal victimization.

Presently, national data on FASD are not available because this issue has only relatively recently garnered attention and there is still no consensus on standard criteria and methods of diagnosis. However, a relatively recent study by Health Canada estimates that, in Canada, between 1 and 9 children in 1,000 are born with FASD, and that the incidence among Aboriginal populations is substantially higher (Health Canada, 2002; Mitten, 2004; Tait, 2002). One study of Manitoba reserves found that 100 live births in 1,000 were affected by the consumption of alcohol during pregnancy (Square, 1997). Despite the lack of national data, various public sectors, such as health care and justice, recognize the importance of determining the prevalence of FASD, particularly among Aboriginal populations.

C3.5 Substance abuse

The relationship between drug and alcohol use and criminal activity is complex. For some, criminal activity may occur in order to finance the substance use or dependence while for others, substance abuse may be part of a criminal lifestyle. In other cases, the use of alcohol and drugs may be a way of coping with either a criminal lifestyle or victimization. The abuse of drugs or alcohol may also contribute to the incidence of violent crime by either impairing the perpetrator's ability to respond appropriately to difficult situations or by rendering individuals more vulnerable to victimization.

While the role of alcohol and drugs in crime can vary, there is empirical evidence of associations between substance use or abuse and crime. For instance, according to the 2004 General Social Survey (GSS) on victimization, in approximately 52% of violent incidents, the victim believed that the incident was related to the perpetrator's use of alcohol or drugs (Gannon and Mihorean, 2005). This represents an increase from 43% reported in 1999. With respect to spousal violence, research has shown that rates are higher for women whose partners abused alcohol (Johnson, 1996; Desjardins and Hotton, 2004; Mihorean, 2005) and that women who were victims of spousal violence turned to alcohol to cope (Rodgers, 1994).


Young adults and teenagers most likely to abuse drugs or alcohol

According to data from the 2002 Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS), more than 4% of males in Canada and nearly 2% of females reported symptoms consistent with a substance dependence.¹⁸⁶ Alcohol dependence affected more young people, especially males aged 15 to 24, compared to all other age groups. About 10% of males aged 15 to 24 reported an alcohol dependency, while only 2% of males aged 25 to 64 had a similar dependency. Results from the CCHS found similar trends with respect to illicit drug dependence. Nearly 4% of young males aged 15 to 24 reported illicit drug dependence compared to less than 1% of all Canadians. Across all age groups, rates for substance dependence on alcohol or illicit drugs were higher for men than for women.

Regular, heavy drinking more prevalent among young males

Data from the 2003 CCHS showed that males drank more frequently than females. Nearly 1 in 3 males (29%) over indulged in regular heavy drinking at least once a month, compared to nearly 12% of women in Canada.¹⁸⁷ Overall, young people aged 20 to 24 were more frequent drinkers compared to all other age groups. Slightly more than half (51%) of all 20- to 24-year-old males were regular heavy drinkers at least once a month, compared to 31% of females in the same age group (Figure C3.4). Regular heavy drinking among teenagers aged 12 to 19 was also high compared to older age groups. Nearly half a million teenagers, or 27%, reported regular heavy drinking in the past 12 months.

Figure C3.4
Regular heavy drinking¹ is most prevalent among young males, 2003



1. Regular heavy drinking is defined in the Canadian Community Health Survey as the consumption of 5 or more drinks on one occasion, 12 or more times a year.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Community Health Survey, 2003.

Among youth, the use of alcohol and drugs is influenced by peers

Research suggests that the consumption of alcohol and illicit drugs among young people is largely influenced by their peer groups. Data from the 1998/99 National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY) showed that among adolescents aged 12 to 15 who had reported that all or most of their friends had used alcohol or drugs, the likelihood of drinking to intoxication or using illicit drugs was significantly higher than among those whose peer group did not consume alcohol or illicit drugs (Hotton & Haans, 2004).

Rate of drug offences highest among young adults and youth

Drug-related violations, such as possession, trafficking, importation and production, were also highest among young adults and youth. According to the a non-representative sample of 122 police services reporting to the Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR2) Survey in 2003, young adults aged 18 to 24 years had the highest rate of drug-related violations (977 per 100,000), followed by youth aged 12 to 17 years (646 per 100,000). The rate of drug-related violations for males was roughly six times higher than that of females. The rates for older individuals declined with age.

C3.6 Mental illness

The mental health of an individual could place them at risk of involvement with the criminal justice system, especially when the mental health problem causes severe disturbances in thinking, feeling and relating and results in a diminished capacity to deal with the demands of every day life. Difficulties can be compounded when the problem is untreated or when there is a lack of appropriate resources and support. Research on the relationship between mental illness and criminal behaviour, particularly violence, is inconclusive. Some research suggests that the relationship between mental illness and criminality is best explained by the presence of specific disorders or characteristics such as Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (Mitten, 2004), substance

abuse or addiction (Arboled-Florez et al, 1996). Arboled-Florez et al. found in their review of the literature that there is no consistent evidence to support the hypothesis that mental illness (e.g. schizophrenia or depression) that is uncomplicated by substance abuse is a significant risk factor for violence or criminality.


Other research suggests that law-breaking or deviant behaviour could be a consequence of the stigma associated with mental illness (Health Canada, 2002). Mental illnesses may create fear, embarrassment, anger and avoidance behaviours by the individual. These feelings can cause individuals to delay seeking health care, avoid following through with recommended treatment, and avoid sharing their concerns with family, friends, co-workers, employers, health service providers and others in the community. This avoidance behaviour and withdrawal could affect the individual's ability to adequately supervise their children or cause them to associate with individuals who have also withdrawn from others. Despite inconclusive evidence on the relationship between mental illness and criminal behaviour, the involvement of the mentally ill in the criminal justice system remains a concern for many, including the police, courts and correctional services.

Females are more likely to report symptoms of mental health disorders

According to the 2002 Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS), 4.5% of the Canadian population aged 15 and over reported symptoms consistent with a mental health disorder (Statistics Canada, 2003k). Women, however, were more likely than men to have reported such symptoms. For example, 5.9% of women and 3.7% of men reported suffering from a major depression (Figure C3.5). Women were also more likely than men to report anxiety (3.4% versus 2.6%) and were more likely to report symptoms consistent with panic disorders (2.0% versus 1.0%). Men and women reported similar feelings and symptoms consistent with mania disorder. Compared to all other age groups, young people aged 15 to 24 years were those most likely to have reported that they had suicidal thoughts in the last twelve months (6%).

Figure C3.5

Mental health disorders more common for women than men, 2002¹



1. Population aged 15 and over are classified as meeting the criteria for these mental disorders in the 12 months prior to the interview. For information regarding the criteria and measurement of the mental disorders presented in this figure, refer to Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS), Cycle 1.2, Statistics Canada catalogue no. 82-617-XIE.

Source: Statistics Canada, Health Statistics Division, Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS): Mental health and well-being, 2002.

Young people are those least likely to feel their mental health needs are being met

Among the women who reported symptoms consistent with mental health disorders, 5.4% did not feel that their needs were being met (Statistics Canada, 2003k). This was also the perception of 3.6% men who reported symptoms of mental health disorders. Further, the CCHS found that teenagers and young people were the least likely to use any resources for their mental health issues or for their use of alcohol or illicit drugs. Among young people aged 15 to 24, nearly 8% felt that they needed help for their mental health but did not receive it. At more than 10%, young women aged 15 to 24 were the most likely to report that their mental health needs were not met.

C3.7 Self-esteem, self-concept and mastery


The transitions from childhood to adolescence and from adolescence to adulthood are often marked by changes and challenges for young people. Research has documented that self-concept, or self-esteem, is important element in this transitional period. Numerous studies have shown that self-esteem, an assessment of one's worth, and "mastery", the extent to which one feels in control of important aspects of one's life, are associated with an individual's self-care, involvement in activities, and mental health (Park, 2003; Spencer et al., 1993; McCaleb et al., 1994). Having a healthy self-concept may help individuals meet daily challenges, protect them against stress and reduce the risk of depression.

Individuals who feel good about themselves are more likely to have strong social bonds with pro-social peers and family members. People with a strong sense of self will also be more inclined to take pride in their actions, behaviour and decisions to obtain success in the future. An individual's belief that he or she has no control over their life or future will feel that there is nothing to lose in engaging in risky or criminal behaviour. A strong self-concept could therefore reduce the likelihood of engaging in deviant behaviour, associating with deviant peers and being victimized.

According to a recent Statistics Canada analysis of data from the 1994/95 National Population Health Survey, adolescent girls aged 12 to 19 tend to have a weaker self-concept than boys and are particularly susceptible to the effects of that perception (Park, 2003). This study also found that boys who reported a weak self-concept in 1994/95 had reduced their physical and social activities in 2000/01.

Health Canada's Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children Study also found that girls are less confident than boys and that confidence in both boys and girls decreases during teenage years (Health Canada, 1999; Health Canada, n.d.). The survey, which has been conducted every four years since 1990 and surveys more than 7,000 students from grades six to ten about their health behaviours and attitudes, found in 2001/02 that 85% of boys and 86% of girls in grade six said they were confident in themselves. By grade 10, rates slipped to 80% for boys and dropped to 65% for girls (Figure C3.6).¹⁸⁸

Figure C3.6
Boys are more self-confident than girls



Source: Health Canada, Health Behaviour in School-age Children Survey, 2001-02.

C3.8 Routine activities and structural choice

The concept of routine activities is often used to examine the risk of criminal offending or being a victim of crime. Some research suggests that criminal offences are related to the nature of everyday patterns of social interaction (Cohen and Felson, 1979; Miethe and Meier, 1990). The opportunity to commit crimes can be a function of the lifestyle of both victims and offenders, and is increased by individuals' exposure to risky situations with the absence of protection or guardianship. More specifically, it is argued that a person's activities and lifestyle create a structure that may increase their contact with potential offenders, both as individuals and for the households in which they live. Research suggests that certain demographic characteristics, such as a person's sex, age, income, main activity (e.g. employed, unemployed or student) and marital status are indicators of lifestyle (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Sacco, Johnson & Arnold, 1993; Kennedy and Forde, 1990).

Certain activities increase one's risk of violent victimization

Results from the 2004 General Social Survey (GSS) on Victimization indicate certain activities were linked to higher rates of violent victimization. For instance, rates of violent victimization increased with the number of evening activities outside the home, the frequency of walking alone after dark and the frequency of using public transportation alone after dark (Table C3.2). Multivariate analysis of data from the 1999 General Social Survey showed that participating in 10 or more evening activities per month was the highest predictive factor of the exposure measures, increasing the odds of violent victimization by about 50% compared to those who participated in fewer than 10 evening activities (Mihorean, 2001).

C3.9 Involvement in crime as a victim

It is important to understand the impact criminal victimization has on an individual and what, if any, relationship there is between being a victim and offending. Research suggests that children and youth who have been victimized often tend to suffer from depression, low self-esteem, can exhibit aggressive or self-destructive behaviour and

are more at risk of delinquent or criminal behaviour (Fitzgerald, 2004; Hotton, 2003; Dauvergne and Johnson, 2001; Widom and Maxfield, 2001; Ristock, 1995; Health Canada, 2004).¹⁸⁹ Other characteristics associated with neglect and maltreatment of youth, such as poor educational performance, mental health problems and substance abuse, may also be an aggravating factor of future offending.

Children account for majority of victims of sexual assault who come to the attention of police

According to data from a non-representative sample of police services that reported to the Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR2) Survey, 22% of victims of violent offences in 2003 were children and youth under the age of 18. Children and youth accounted for 61% of victims of sexual assault who came to the attention of the sample of police departments, and 21% of victims of physical assault (AuCoin, 2005b).

The risk of victimization for children and youth increased with age and, as children aged, they were more at risk of victimization by those outside the family (AuCoin, 2005b). According to UCR2 data from 2003, the majority of victims of violent crime under six years of age were harmed by a family member. For children and youth between 6 and 17 years of age, non-family members, such as acquaintances, friends and strangers, were responsible for the largest proportion of victimizations. Up until the age of eight, police-reported rates of violent victimization for boys and girls were similar. However, after eight years of age, rates for boys exceeded those for girls.

Compared to older age groups, rates of victimization were highest among 15- to 24-year-olds

Another source of data that can be used to explore the experiences of young people as victims is the 2004 General Social Survey (GSS) on Victimization which surveyed Canadians 15 years and older about their experiences with eight types of crimes. Unlike police-reported data, the GSS obtains information on the victimization respondents experienced, regardless of whether these incidents were reported to police. At a rate of 226 per 1,000, young people aged 15 to 24 experienced the highest rate of violent victimization among all age groups.¹⁹⁰

Children who witness violence in the home are at greater risk of aggressive behaviour

Individuals who witness violence in the home can experience many of the same emotional consequences as victims of abuse. According to data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth, in 1998/99 378,000 children between the ages of 6 and 11, or 17% of children in this age group, witnessed violence in the home at some point in their lives. The same survey found that exposure to violence in the home has a strong association with aggressive behaviour among children, especially for boys and those in low-income households (Hotton, 2003). Anxiety and aggression among children who witness violence in the home could continue into adolescence and adulthood, manifesting into criminal behaviour and contact with the justice system. In fact, several studies have shown that children who have witnessed family violence may be more likely to approve of the use of violence for conflict resolution (Carlson, 1991; Jaffe et al., 1986), and are more likely to display aggressive behaviour (Dauvergne and Johnson, 2001). In terms of victimization, data from the 1993 Violence Against Women Survey indicate that women who witnessed their mother being assaulted had higher rates of victimization by a spouse than those who grew up without witnessing violence. Similarly, rates of violence were higher in relationships where male partners as children had witnessed their father abusing their mother (Rodgers, 1995).

Appendix C

Tables for Context of crime

Table C1.1
Government transfers for families and unattached individuals, 2003

	Average dollar amount (\$)	Percent of after-tax income ¹	Percent of total transfers
Families (two persons or more)			
Total	7,800	11	100
Lowest quintile ²	11,100	49	28
Second quintile	10,000	24	26
Third quintile	7,700	13	20
Fourth quintile	5,600	7	15
Highest quintile	4,500	3	12
Unattached individuals			
Total	5,400	17	100
Lowest quintile ²	3,800	54	14
Second quintile	9,000	60	34
Third quintile	7,400	32	27
Fourth quintile	4,100	12	15
Highest quintile	2,600	4	10

1. After-tax income refers to the amount after income taxes are paid and government transfers are received.

2. Quintiles are created by ranking people's after-tax income from lowest to highest and dividing into five equally sized groups (20% each).

Source: Statistics Canada, Income Statistics Division, Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics.

Table C1.2**Type of dwelling and ownership, Canada, provinces and territories, 2001**

	Dwelling type						Ownership	
	Total occupied private dwellings		Single-detached house	Apartment, five or more stories	Moveable dwelling ¹	Other dwelling ²	Owned	Rented
	Number	Percent						
Canada	11,562,975	100	57	9	1	32	66	34
Newfoundland and Labrador	189,040	100	75	0	1	23	78	22
Prince Edward Island	50,795	100	73	0	4	23	73	27
Nova Scotia	360,202	100	68	4	4	24	71	29
New Brunswick	283,820	100	73	1	4	22	74	25
Quebec	2,978,115	100	46	5	1	48	58	42
Ontario	4,219,410	100	58	16	0	26	68	32
Manitoba	432,555	100	69	9	2	21	68	30
Saskatchewan	379,680	100	76	3	2	19	71	27
Alberta	1,104,100	100	65	4	3	27	70	29
British Columbia	1,534,335	100	55	7	3	36	66	33
Yukon Territory	11,365	100	68	0	8	24	63	31
Northwest Territories	12,565	100	64	2	4	30	53	46
Nunavut	7,175	100	59	2	0	39	24	76

1. Refers to a single dwelling used as a place of residence but capable of being moved on short notice. Examples include mobile homes, tents, recreational vehicles, travel trailers or houseboats.

2. Includes semi-detached houses, row houses, apartments or flats in a detached duplex, apartments in a building with fewer than five storeys, and other single attached houses.

Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division, 2001 Census of Population.

Table C1.3**Dwelling characteristics and ownership, Census Metropolitan Areas, 2001**

	Dwelling structure					Ownership		
	Total occupied private dwellings		Single-detached house	Apartment, five or more stories	Moveable dwelling ¹	Other dwelling ²	Owned	Rented
	Number	Percent	Percent of dwellings				Percent of dwellings	
Abbotsford, British Columbia	51,025	100	71	29
Calgary, Alberta	356,370	100	61	7	1	31	71	29
Chicoutimi-Jonquière, Quebec	62,200	100	62	38
Edmonton, Alberta	356,515	100	59	6	2	33	66	34
Greater Sudbury, Ontario	63,140	100	64	7	1	28	66	34
Halifax, Nova Scotia	144,435	100	52	9	2	36	62	38
Hamilton, Ontario	253,085	100	59	17	0	24	68	32
Kingston, Ontario	58,335	100	64	36
Kitchener, Ontario	153,275	100	56	11	0	33	67	33
London, Ontario	173,120	100	56	16	0	28	63	37
Montréal, Quebec	1,417,365	100	32	9	0	59	50	50
Oshawa, Ontario	104,205	100	66	9	0	25	76	24
Ottawa-Gatineau, Ontario/Quebec	415,940	100	45	16	0	38	62	38
Québec, Quebec	295,105	100	42	6	1	51	56	44
Regina, Saskatchewan	76,655	100	70	5	0	24	68	32
Saint John, New Brunswick	48,260	100	58	3	3	35	67	33
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan	88,945	100	62	5	1	32	65	35
Sherbrooke, Quebec	66,285	100	43	3	1	53	52	48
St.Catharines-Niagara, Ontario	150,870	100	70	6	0	24	73	27
St.John's, Newfoundland and Labrador	64,830	100	56	1	0	42	69	31
Thunder Bay, Ontario	49,545	100	71	5	0	23	72	28
Toronto, Ontario	1,634,755	100	45	27	0	28	63	37
Trois-Rivières, Quebec	59,580	100	48	2	0	50	57	43
Vancouver, British Columbia	758,715	100	43	12	1	44	61	39
Victoria, British Columbia	135,605	100	51	5	1	43	63	37
Windsor, Ontario	117,710	100	70	11	0	19	72	28
Winnipeg, Manitoba	269,980	100	62	13	0	25	65	34

.. not available for a specific reference period

1. Refers to a single dwelling used as a place of residence but capable of being moved on short notice. Examples include mobile homes, tents, recreational vehicles, travel trailers or houseboats.
2. Includes semi-detached houses, row houses, apartments or flats in a detached duplex, apartments in a building with fewer than five storeys, and other single attached houses.

Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division, 2001 Census of Population.

Table C1.4**The extent to which Canadians know the people in their immediate neighbourhood, by selected characteristics, Canada, 2003**

Length of time individual has lived in the neighbourhood	People known in immediate neighbourhood					Total
	Most	Many	A few	Nobody else	Not stated	
People living in CMAs						
Percent of population 15 years and older						
less than 1 year	4	5	62	29	F	100
1 to 3 years	9	10	67	13	F	100
3 to 4 years	14	14	63	9	F	100
5 years or more	26	21	50	4	0 ^E	100
People living in non-CMAs						
less than 1 year	13	7	60	20	F	100
1 to 3 years	23	15	55	8	F	100
3 to 4 years	37	12	47	4 ^E	F	100
5 years or more	53	18	28	2	F	100

^E use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey on Social Engagement, 2003.

Table C2.1**Rate of police-reported child abuse, by family members and non-family members, subset of police services, 1998 to 2003^{1,2,3,4,5}**

	Total			
	Relationship of accused to victim			
	Family ⁸		Non-family ⁹	
	Rate per 100,000	Year to year percentage change	Rate per 100,000	Year to year percentage change
1998	160		480	
1999	160	0	473	-1
2000	174	9	520	10
2001	174	0	508	-2
2002	189	9	507	0
2003	175	-7	481	-5
Percentage change in rate 1998 to 2003		9		0
	Sexual assaults⁶			
	Relationship of accused to victim			
	Family ⁸		Non-family ⁹	
	Rate per 100,000	Year to year percentage change	Rate per 100,000	Year to year percentage change
1998	57		117	
1999	55	-3	116	-1
2000	60	9	124	7
2001	62	3	122	-2
2002	68	10	126	3
2003	65	-5	118	-6
Percentage change in rate 1998 to 2003		14		1
	Physical assaults⁷			
	Relationship of accused to victim			
	Family ⁸		Non-family ⁹	
	Rate per 100,000	Year to year percentage change	Rate per 100,000	Year to year percentage change
1998	112		389	
1999	113	1	382	-2
2000	123	9	423	11
2001	121	-2	412	-3
2002	130	7	407	-1
2003	119	-8	388	-5
Percentage change in rate 1998 to 2003		6		0

1. Excludes incidents where the sex and/or the age of the victim was unknown.

2. Excludes incidents where the accused-victim relationship was unknown.

3. Children and youth include all those under the age of 18.

4. Data are not nationally representative. Based on data from 71 police services which accounted for 46% of the national volume of crime as of December 31, 2003.

5. Rate per 100,000 population less than 18 years of age, based on estimates provided by Demography Division, Statistics Canada.

6. Sexual assault includes sexual assault, sexual assault with a weapon, aggravated sexual assault and the "other sexual crimes" category which includes sexual interference, sexual touching, sexual exploitation, incest, etc.

7. Physical assault includes assault levels 1, 2 and 3, unlawfully causing bodily harm, discharge firearm with intent, criminal negligence causing bodily harm and other assaults.

8. Family includes spouse, ex-spouse, parent, child, sibling and extended family.

9. Non-family includes close friend, business relationship, casual acquaintance and stranger.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR2) Trend Database.

Table C3.1**High school dropout rates among 20-year-olds, Canada and the provinces, 1991 and 1999**

	1991 ¹			1999 ²		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
	Percent			Percent		
Canada	18	22	14	12.0	14.7	9.2
Newfoundland and Labrador	24	29	19	10.5 ^E	15.2 ^E	5.7 ^E
Prince Edward Island	25	33	17	F	F	F
Nova Scotia	22	29	13 ^E	10.1 ^E	14.5 ^E	F
New Brunswick	20	23	16 ^E	7.6 ^E	11.7 ^E	F
Quebec	22	26	18 ^E	16.0	19.9	12.0
Ontario ¹	17	22	10 ^E	9.5	11.2	7.8
Manitoba	19	20	18	14.8	15.7 ^E	13.9 ^E
Saskatchewan	16	16 ^E	16 ^E	7.3	9.9 ^E	4.5 ^E
Alberta	14	16 ^E	12 ^E	12.5	13.8 ^E	11.1 ^E
British Columbia	16	17 ^E	14 ^E	12.9	16.7 ^E	8.9

^E use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

1. Data source is Statistics Canada's School Leavers Survey.

2. Data source is Statistics Canada's Youth in Transition Survey which replaced the School Leavers Survey as the source for data on drop out rates.

Source: Bowlby, J.W. and K. McMullen. 2002. *At a Crossroads: First Results of the 18 to 20-year-old Cohort of the Youth in Transition Survey*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 81-591. Ottawa: Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada.**Table C3.2****Rate of violent victimization, by exposure characteristics, 2004**

Measures of exposure	Total violent crimes ¹	
	Number of incidents (Thousands)	Rate per 1,000 population 15 years and older
Total	2,109	81
Number of evening activities per month		
Less than 10	162	26
10 to 19	307	52
20 to 29	393	77
30 or more	1,248	145
Frequency of walking alone in area after dark		
Daily	595	147
Once a week	788	93
Once a month	293	73
Less than once a month	176	55
Never	253	41
Frequency of waiting for/using public transportation alone at night		
Daily	187	194
Once a week	297	172
Once a month	238	151
Less than once a month	245	112
Never	695	57

1. Excludes all incidents of sexual and physical assault committed by spouses. Violent crime includes sexual assault, robbery and assault.

Notes: Figures may not add to total due to rounding.

Responses of "don't know/not stated" are not shown.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey on Victimization, 2004.

Endnotes

1. In addition to the national, provincial and territorial data presented, all police-reported data are also available at the lower geographic levels of Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) and according to the police service.
2. For more information, see Sauvé, J. 2005. "Canadian Crime Statistics, 2004." *Juristat*. 25(5). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
3. 'Other Criminal Code offences' includes mischief, counterfeiting currency, bail violations, disturbing the peace, offensive weapons offences, prostitution, and other offences not included within the categories of violent and property crime.
4. For more detail on homicides, see Dauvergne, M. 2005. "Homicide in Canada, 2004." *Juristat*. 25(6). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
5. A study of youths' prior contacts with police demonstrated that the likelihood of charges increases substantially with the number of prior police contacts, even when other factors are controlled (Carrington and Schulenberg, 2004).
6. It should be noted that mediation can also be an intervention at different stages of the criminal justice process. In some cases, mediation is considered a stand-alone sentence, while it can also be combined with another sentence, such as probation.
7. Alternative Measures include programs, authorized by the Attorney General in a province or territory, which may be offered at the pre-charge stage, the post-charge stage, or both. In 2002/03, data were not available from Nova Scotia, Alberta or Nunavut. In addition, it should be noted that Ontario only reports data for 16- to 17-year-olds.
8. The total for 1997/98 excludes Nova Scotia in order to render totals for 1997/98 and 2002/03 comparable.
9. For this analysis, jurisdictions reporting for the last two years were included: Newfoundland and Labrador, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, the Yukon, and the Northwest Territories.
10. The rate of alternative measures for Ontario youths aged 16 and 17 was 65 per 10,000 youths.
11. Data were available for Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and Northwest Territories.
12. Data were available for Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia.
13. Part of this initial decrease in 2003/04 may also be attributable to issues associated with the first year of implementation of the new legislation. For more information on the *Youth Criminal Justice Act*, refer to Section B2.2 of this report.
14. This section represents the longest trend analysis possible for jurisdictions consistently reporting to the survey between 1994/95 and 2003/04 (Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Yukon) and represents approximately 80% of the national adult criminal court caseload.
15. Municipal courts account for approximately one-quarter of federal statute charges in Quebec.
16. Other decisions may include the court accepted a special plea and the accused was found unfit to stand trial.
17. Also, differences among jurisdictional operational systems may restrict uniform application of definitions in some situations and therefore, inter-jurisdictional comparisons should be made with caution.
18. On April 1, 2003, the *Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA)* replaced the *Young Offenders Act (YOA)* as the basis for Canada's youth justice system. However, data are only currently available for the period in which the YOA was in effect.
19. Count data come from the Corrections Key Indicator Report, 1992/93 to 2002/03.
20. Due to missing data for some years, Ontario youths aged 12 to 15 have been excluded.
21. Admission data come from the Youth Corrections and Community Services Survey (YCCS), 1996/97 to 2002/03. YCCS units of count for Alberta and Newfoundland and Labrador have been tabulated from micro data that are based on national standardized definitions that differ from the definitions being used within Alberta and Newfoundland and Labrador. In Alberta, there are substantial methodological differences such that these statistics based on national data standards cannot be reproduced by Alberta Correctional Services. Accordingly, caution should be used when comparing statistics generated by these jurisdictions with statistics that have been generated by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

22. Due to missing data for some years, Ontario youths aged 12 to 15 and Saskatchewan youths have been excluded.
23. Because of missing data for some years, data for Northwest Territories and Nunavut were excluded.
24. The court must be “satisfied that serving a sentence in the community would not endanger the safety of the community and would be consistent with the fundamental purpose and principles of sentencing set out in sections 718 to 718.2” (*Criminal Code*, s. 742.1).
25. In 1997, the *Criminal Code* provisions to ensure attendance in court and for the protection or the safety of the public were retained. A new paragraph was added permitting detention on the grounds of any other just cause and where “the detention is necessary in order to maintain confidence in the administration of justice having regard to all the circumstances” (Johnson, 2003).
26. Because of missing data for some years, data for New Brunswick, Manitoba, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut have been excluded.
27. Another indicator of the workload of probation and parole officers has frequently been determined by the client caseload size; that is, the ratio of offenders to workers. While an ideal size for a caseload has been debated, professional organizations have pointed to issues compounding the determination of ideal size (American Probation and Parole Association, 2003).
28. Excludes releases for warrant expiry, transfers, deaths and other reasons that do not require supervision.
29. Count data come from the Corrections Key Indicators Report, 1992/93 to 2002/03. Depending on the province/territory, a portion of youths on probation may be participating in an alternative measures program, as opposed to being sentenced.
30. Due to the unavailability of data, youths aged 12 to 15 in Ontario are excluded for all years, New Brunswick for 2000/01, Northwest Territories for 1997/98 to 2002/03, and Nunavut for 1999/00, 2000/01, and 2002/03.
31. Due to the unavailability of data, Ontario youths aged 12 to 15 have been excluded. Also, see footnote 21.
32. Probation admissions data for 1997/98 to 2002/03 by most serious offence are available for Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, Ontario (for youths aged 16 to 17 only), Alberta, and British Columbia. Also, see footnote 21.
33. Depending on the province/territory, a portion of adults on probation may be participating in an alternative measures program, rather than being sentenced.
34. Because of missing data for some years, probation and conditional sentencing data for New Brunswick, Northwest Territories and Nunavut have been excluded.
35. Because of missing data for some years, data for Manitoba, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut have been excluded.
36. Day parole is the release of an offender into the community granted by the National Parole Board (or a provincial parole board if applicable) to prepare the offenders for full parole or statutory release. The offender must return to a penitentiary, a community-based residential facility or a provincial correctional facility each night. Full parole is the release of an offender into the community to serve part of their prison sentence. Statutory release is the release of federal offenders into the community after serving two-thirds of their sentence, unless they are detained by the National Parole Board or they waive statutory release. See Statistics Canada, 2003. *Adult Correctional Services in Canada, 2002-2003* for more information.
37. Parole data for British Columbia are not available.
38. Pardons permit convicted persons who have completed their sentence and demonstrated that they are law-abiding citizens to have their criminal records sealed.
39. Victim refers to both direct victims and other people affected by a crime, but who were not the victim, such as family, friends and witnesses.
40. The “protection of persons and property” category includes national defense and other protection costs such as regulatory measures and firefighting.
41. Justice spending includes spending on policing, courts and corrections. After 1998/99 ‘justice’ as a unique category no longer existed on Statistics Canada’s Financial Management System (FMS) and was combined in the broader category of ‘protection of persons and property’. Figures exclude any spending or investments in security and crime prevention by the private sector.
42. While it appears that British Columbia experienced a 4% decrease in per capita spending between 1996/97 and 2002/03, the decrease may be driven largely by the unavailability of data on prosecution expenditure for 2002/03.
43. After publication of 2002/03 spending figures on correctional services in Nova Scotia, the department of Justice in Nova Scotia detected a possibility of under-reporting for that year, which would affect overall per capital justice spending. The issue is currently under review.
44. For further information, see Gannon, M. and K. Mihorean. 2005. “Criminal Victimization in Canada, 2004.” *Juristat*. 25(7). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
45. In 1999 the GSS was tested in the Northwest Territories, the Yukon Territory and Nunavut and the results indicated that Aboriginal people living in remote areas were under-represented. In 2004, the GSS was again pilot-tested in these jurisdictions, but the data were not available in time for inclusion in this report.
46. This rate includes incidents of physical and sexual spousal violence.
47. Western provinces include Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

48. Between September and December 2004, Canada collected data for the 2004 International Crime Victimization Survey, but data were not available in time for inclusion in this publication.
49. For more information, see Besserer, S. 2002. "Criminal Victimization: An International Perspective – Results of the 2000 International Crime Victimization Survey." *Juristat*. 22(4). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
50. The 13 countries that participated in the 2000 survey include Canada, Australia, Belgium, England and Wales, Finland, France, Japan, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Poland, Scotland, Sweden, and the United States. Of the remaining four remaining industrialized countries, Catalonia (a region of Spain), Denmark and Portugal are excluded because they have participated only once in the survey, therefore no trend data are available; and, Switzerland is excluded because of the lack of some key data.
51. These data exclude incidents of spousal sexual and physical assaults because spousal assault information was not collected in 1993.
52. Some limitations on coverage of the Adult Criminal Court survey should be noted. Manitoba is not included in the survey for any year. Since the creation of the territory of Nunavut, that jurisdiction has not reported to the survey. Data from the Northwest Territories are not available for 1996/97, and for the years 2000/01 to 2003/04. New Brunswick and British Columbia began reporting to the survey in 2001/02. Some court locations in Quebec are not included. Information from Quebec's municipal courts (which account for one-quarter of *Criminal Code* charges in that province) is not yet collected. With the exception of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Alberta, British Columbia and the Yukon Territory, no data are provided by superior courts.
53. The absence of data from all but six superior court jurisdictions may result in a slight underestimation of the severity of sentences imposed across Canada. The reason for this is that some of the most serious cases, which are likely to result in the most severe sanctions, are processed in superior courts. While these limitations are important, comparisons from one year to another are possible if the reporting jurisdictions used in the comparisons are held constant.
54. Cases can have more than one sentence. However, in order to analyze the severity of sentences imposed and changes over time, data on only the most serious sentence in convicted cases are employed. Analysis is based on the number of convicted cases where the most serious sentence was known. Cases where the most serious sentence was unknown accounts for less than 1%.
55. The Adult Criminal Court Survey (ACCS) began collecting data on conditional sentences in 1998/99 from Newfoundland and Labrador, Ontario and Alberta. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan and the Yukon Territory began reporting conditional sentencing data to the ACCS from 1999/00, and New Brunswick and British Columbia from 2001/02. Quebec does not report conditional sentencing data at this time.
56. Quebec does not report conditional sentencing data at this time.
57. For a description of the sentencing options under the YOA, refer to Robinson, Paul. 2004. "Youth Court Statistics, 2002/03" *Juristat* 24(2). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. For a summary of the sentencing options under the YCJA, refer to Thomas, Jennifer. 2005, "Youth Court Statistics, 2003/04." *Juristat* 25(4). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Also, refer to YCJA Explained available at <http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/ps/yj/ycja/ycja.html>.
58. A case may have more than one sentence. The analysis presented is based on the most serious sentence in a case. The most serious sentence is determined by the effect that the sentence has on the young person. Sentences under the YOA are ordered from most to least significant as follows: secure custody, open custody, probation, fine, compensation, pay purchaser, compensation in kind, community service order, restitution, prohibition/seizure/forfeiture, other sentences, conditional discharge and absolute discharge.
59. See footnote 52 for information regarding coverage of the Adult Criminal Court Survey.
60. The sentence length was unknown for 9% of prison terms imposed in 2003/04.
61. Because Quebec does not report data from municipal courts, which account for one-quarter of federal statute charges in that province, caution should be used when comparing sentence lengths in Quebec to other jurisdictions.
62. It should be noted that Quebec does not report fines for offences under the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act* to the Adult Court Survey.
63. Under the YCJA, youth courts may sentence a young offender to probation for a maximum of two years, a maximum that also applied under the YOA.
64. This survey defined "restorative justice processes for criminal justice matters" as any process in which the victim, the offender, and, where appropriate, any other individuals or community members affected by a crime, participate together actively in the resolution of matters arising from the crime, generally with the help of a facilitator. Restorative processes may include mediation, conciliation, conferencing and sentencing circles.
65. This report examined the conviction profiles of persons aged 18 to 25 who were found guilty of at least one charge in an adult criminal court during the fiscal year 1999/00. Recidivists were defined as those with at least one prior conviction in adult criminal court since 1994/95 or in youth court since 1991/92 within the same province or territory.
66. This pilot study was based on data from the Integrated Correctional Services Survey (ICSS) developed by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics at Statistics Canada. It is a new person-based survey that is currently being implemented in jurisdictions across Canada. The survey collects detailed data of both young offenders and adults involved in correctional services in Canada.

67. "Involvement" is defined as a continuous period of involvement in a specific jurisdiction's correctional system. This continuous period may include cases where the legal hold statuses may change (i.e., remand followed by sentenced custody which is followed by probation), but where supervision is continuous. For more information on this study, see Johnson, Sara. 2005. "Returning to Correctional Services after release: A profile of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal adults in Saskatchewan Corrections from 1999/00 to 2003/04" in *Juristat* 25(2). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
68. For more national and provincial information on levels of public satisfaction with the criminal justice system, see Gannon, Maire. 2005. *General Social Survey on Victimization, Cycle 18: An Overview of Findings*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-565. Ottawa: Minister of Industry (available free at www.statcan.ca). For data at the CMA level, see Statistics Canada. 2005. *Cycle 18 Overview: Personal Safety and Perceptions of the Criminal Justice System*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-566. Ottawa: Statistics Canada (available free at www.statcan.ca).
69. This represents the wording used in the survey and it can be assumed that it represents all sectors of the justice system other than the police.
70. Atlantic provinces include Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.
71. Western provinces include Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.
72. Depending on sample size, these data may be produced at the provincial level. For more information on levels of public satisfaction with their personal safety, see Gannon, Maire. 2005. *General Social Survey on Victimization, Cycle 18: An Overview of Findings*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 56-565. Ottawa: Statistics Canada (available free at www.statcan.ca) and Ogg, S. 2001. "Perceptions and fear of crime" in S. Besserer (ed.) *A Profile of Criminal Victimization: Results of the 1999 General Social Survey*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-553. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
73. Depending on sample size, these data may be produced at the provincial level. For more information on levels of public satisfaction with the criminal justice system, see Gannon, Maire. 2005. *General Social Survey on Victimization, Cycle 18: An Overview of Findings*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-565. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Available free at www.statcan.ca.
74. Includes *Criminal Code* and other federal statute violations, as well as *Criminal Code* traffic violations. Cleared otherwise includes those incidents where an accused is identified, but not charged for one of the following reasons: the complainant requests charges not be laid, departmental discretion, suicide of accused, death of the accused, death of the complainant, reasons beyond the control of the department, diplomatic immunity, accused is less than 12 years old, committal of the accused to a mental hospital, accused is involved in other incidents, accused is already sentenced, and admittance into a diversionary program.
75. In addition to the national, provincial and territorial data presented, all police reported data are also available at the lower geographic levels of Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) and according to the police service boundaries.
76. Percentages do not add to the total because of rounding.
77. The number of appearances per case are only collected through the Adult Court Survey.
78. As information from Quebec's municipal courts is not yet reported to the survey, the average case processing time for this jurisdiction is higher (326 days) and is not comparable with the other jurisdictions. Municipal courts account for about one-quarter of *Criminal Code* charges in that province and generally process the less serious, summary offences which are the least lengthy to process.
79. Includes all provinces and the Yukon Territory, but excludes the Northwest Territories and Nunavut.
80. The remaining 2% were adults held under other statuses.
81. For more detail and for national, provincial and territorial data tables, see Kelly, Bess. 2005. *Legal Aid in Canada: Resource and Caseload Statistics, 2003/04*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85F0015XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
82. It should be noted that approval counts reflect only applications approved for full legal aid service. Since many jurisdictions cannot provide counts for summary legal aid services (i.e., the provision of legal advice, information or any other type of minimal legal service granted to an individual during a formal interview), these are not collected by the Legal Aid Survey.
83. About half of this growth can be attributed to demographic factors, such as the high birth rate among Aboriginal women. The remainder of this growth can be attributed to an increase in the number of people identifying themselves as Aboriginal and to a better enumeration of reserves.
84. Aboriginal people include people who identified themselves as either pure Aboriginal or of mixed descent. Visible minorities include persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour. The visible minority population includes those reporting themselves as Chinese, South Asian, Black, Arab/West Asian, Filipino, Southeast Asian, Latin American, Japanese, Korean and Pacific Islander.
85. It should be noted that for all questions rating the police, the courts and the correction and parole systems, rates of "don't know/not stated" were higher among visible minority respondents than respondents in the other two groups.
86. It is important to note that across all three groups, a large proportion of the population was unsure how to rate the prison and parole systems or did not state a response.

87. Although 15% of Aboriginal people rated the parole system as doing a good job at supervising offenders, this result does not represent a statistically significant difference from the results for the other two groups.
88. Data to inform this measure is only currently available with respect to feelings of discrimination based on ethnicity and among visible minorities.
89. The Ethnic Diversity Survey covers a number of topics including ethnic and cultural ancestry, ethnic identity, knowledge of languages, social networks, interaction with others and civic participation. The survey was conducted between April and August of 2002 and approximately 42,500 people aged 15 years and older were interviewed by telephone across the ten provinces.
90. Respondents were asked if they experienced discrimination in any of the following situations in the past 5 years: on the street; in a store, bank or restaurant; at work or when applying for a job or promotion; when dealing with the police or courts; or somewhere else (specify). This was a multiple response questions asked of all respondents who reported discrimination.
91. Refers to Canada's non-Aboriginal population aged 15 years and older.
92. Use with caution.
93. Use with caution.
94. Use with caution.
95. While data from the 1993 Violence Against Women Survey show that 29% of incidents that occurred in the five years prior to the survey were reported to the police, the survey did not ask whether or not it was reported by the victim herself. Therefore, while this information suggests that overall reporting of wife assault has increased since 1993, it cannot be determined if reporting by the victim herself has grown.
96. Services under this model assist victims throughout their contact with the criminal justice system from the police through to the corrections stage. This model can be characterized as "one-stop" service delivery.
97. Refer to Table A5.1 for definitions of the types of shelters.
98. It should be noted that in the fall of 2004, the Ontario government announced an increase in funding for shelters for abused women.
99. In the remainder of the incidents, the victim either did not provide a response or responded "don't know".
100. For more information on legislative developments with respect to victim rights, see Department of Justice, n.d. The Policy Centre for Victim Issues. "Legislation" at <http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/ps/voc.index.html>.
101. In its report, the National Parole Board notes that significant variances in data between and within regions are likely a result of inconsistent recording practices between regions and recent changes in practices. Further, increases may be a result of the NPB making greater efforts over the last few years to improve relations and contacts with victims and the public.
102. These jurisdictions represent the longest trend possible for jurisdictions reporting consistently from 1994/95 to 2003/04. While both Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island have been consistently reporting to the ACCS, they do not report data on issuances of peace bonds and have therefore also been excluded from this analysis. The objective of the ACCS is to track court dispositions for criminal offences and the issuance of a peace bond pursuant to section 810 of the *Criminal Code* does not constitute an offence, which is why not all jurisdictions report data on issuances to the ACCS.
103. A true rate at which peace bonds are breached cannot be obtained through these data as individual micro data records are not available for issuances.
104. Depending on sample size, these data may be produced at the provincial level. For more information, see AuCoin, Kathy. 2005. "Stalking – Criminal Harassment" in K. AuCoin (ed.) *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile 2005*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
105. The remaining 15% of victims either did not know or did not state the type of court wherein the protective order was issued.
106. Depending on sample size, these data may be produced at the provincial level. For more information, see Mihorean, Karen. 2005. "Trends in self-reported spousal violence" in K. AuCoin (ed.) *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile 2005*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
107. Use with caution. Percentages do not add to 100 because of 'not stated'.
108. Use with caution.
109. Use with caution.
110. Figures may not add to 100% due to multiple responses.
111. Refer to section B2.5 for a more detailed description and definition of restorative justice programs.
112. British Columbia's compensation program was unable to respond to the Victim Services Survey because of changes to the administration of the program and to its information management system that occurred in 2002. It can be noted that, in 2001, British Columbia's Criminal Injuries Compensation Program accepted 3,222 applications and denied 1,376. That year, a total of \$18,319,925 was paid on 4,713 claims (Workers' Compensation Board of British Columbia and the Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General, 2002).

113. Data on the age of Canadians are available free at www.statcan.ca. For data at the national, provincial or territorial level, click on “Canadian Statistics” and for community level information, click on “Community Profiles.”
114. This section presents the analysis and findings by Pottie Bunge et al. 2005. *Exploring Crime Patterns in Canada*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-561-MIE005. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
115. Atlantic provinces include Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.
116. Data on Aboriginal populations for various geographic levels are available free at www.statcan.ca in *Aboriginal Peoples of Canada, 2001 Census*. Statistics Canada catalogue no.97F0011XCB2001002. Users can also obtain high level information by clicking on “Canadian Statistics” or “Community Profiles.”
117. In addition to the national, provincial and territorial data presented, all police-reported data are available at the lower geographic levels of Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) and according to the police service boundaries.
118. Young women have the highest rates of spousal violence.
119. Data on immigrants, visible minorities and languages spoken are available free at www.statcan.ca. For data at the national, provincial or territorial level, click on “Canadian Statistics” and for community level information, click on “Community Profiles.”
120. Based on administrative data from Citizenship and Immigration Canada.
121. Visible minorities are defined by the *Employment Equity Act* as “persons other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour”.
122. GDP data are based on the expenditure base of national economic and financial accounts. The GDP can refer to both the total income of Canadians in the economy, as well as the total expenditure on goods and services produced within the country. These factors, however, are not mutually exclusive, and in fact, equal one another. Chained 1997 dollars represent a more accurate measure of real GDP. Data on the Gross Domestic Product are available free at www.statcan.ca by clicking on “Canadian Statistics” then “Subject” then “National accounts”.
123. The eight major components of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) basket are: “food”, “shelter”, “household operations and furnishings”, “clothing and footwear”, “transportation”, “health and personal care”, “recreation, education and reading”, and “alcoholic beverages and tobacco products”. Data on the CPI are available free at www.statcan.ca. For data at the national, provincial or CMA level, click on “Canadian Statistics”.
124. It should be noted that due to research design and the statistical method used (i.e. time-series analysis), the study was restricted to examining four major crime types: homicide, robbery, break and enter and motor vehicle theft.
125. After-tax income refers to the amount after income taxes are paid and government transfers are received. National data on average income are available free at www.statcan.ca by clicking on “Canadian Statistics” then “Subject” then “Personal finance and household finance” then “Income”. Data on average incomes for the provinces and for various Census Metropolitan areas are available from CANSIM Table 202-0603. In addition, for further analysis and data on income for Canada and the provinces, refer to Statistics Canada, 2005. *Income in Canada*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 75-202. Ottawa: Statistics Canada (available free at www.statcan.ca).
126. Refers to families with two or more persons and unattached individuals.
127. National data on low income are available free at www.statcan.ca by clicking on “Canadian Statistics” then “Subject” then “Personal finance and household finance” then “Income”. Data on the low income among individuals and families for the provinces and for various Census Metropolitan Areas are available from CANSIM Tables 202-0802 and 202-0804. In addition, for further analysis and data on income for Canada and the provinces, refer to Statistics Canada, 2005. *Income in Canada*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 75-202. Ottawa: Statistics Canada (available free at www.statcan.ca).
128. Low-income cut-offs take into account differences in family size and variations in the costs by community size. Generally, the costs of living are higher for larger communities. For this analysis, after-tax income is used.
129. Use with caution.
130. Low-paid workers are defined as individuals with weekly earnings of less than \$410.70 at the end of 1996.
131. Data on annual unemployment rates are available at the national and provincial levels from CANSIM Table 282-0002, which can be accessed for a fee through www.statcan.ca.
132. Data on government transfers at the national and provincial levels are available from Statistics Canada. 2005. *Income in Canada*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 75-202. Ottawa: Statistics Canada (available free at www.statcan.ca) and CANSIM Table 202-0301.
133. Quintiles are created by ranking people’s after-tax income from lowest to highest and dividing into five equally sized groups (20% each).
134. Earnings refer to earnings from both paid employment (wages and salaries) and self-employment.
135. Data on income inequality are available from Statistics Canada, 2005. *Income in Canada*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 75-202. Ottawa: Statistics Canada (available free at www.statcan.ca). Data at the national and provincial levels are available from CANSIM table 202-0705.
136. Quintiles are created by ranking people’s after-tax income from lowest to highest and dividing into five equally sized groups (20% each).

137. After-tax income refers to the amount after income taxes are paid and government transfers are received.
138. Some arguments to the contrary include Hartnagel and Lee (1990) who suggest that it is more the actual use of physical space, the population size and population density at a single point in time that are associated with increased crime rates rather than the actual transformation of a specific geographical area from rural to urban. Also, Rogers (1989) found that in many nations, industrialization, urbanization and rapid social change have been accompanied by decreases in crime rates.
139. According to the Census of Population boundaries, urban areas comprise Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs) and Census Agglomerations (CAs). A CMA has an urban core of 100,000 or over and includes all neighbouring municipalities where 50% or more of the labour force commutes to the urban core. A CA has an urban core of 10,000 to 99,999 and follows the same commuting rule as a CMA. Rural and small towns refer to municipalities with urban populations of 1,000 to 9,999 and rural areas, where less than 50% of the population commutes to the urban core for work.
140. The only province to experience increases in their rural and small town populations were Ontario, Manitoba, and Alberta (Statistics Canada, 2002b).
141. Data on changes in population counts are available free at www.statcan.ca. For data at the provincial, territorial or CMA levels by clicking on "Canadian Statistics" then "Subject" then "Population characteristics" then "Population by year by province and territory" or "Population of Census Metropolitan Areas". For data at lower levels of geography, click on "Community Profiles."
142. The extended Golden Horseshoe consists of the urban centres of Oshawa, Toronto, Hamilton, St. Catharines-Niagara, Kitchener, Guelph and Barrie.
143. Lower Mainland consists of the urban centres of Vancouver, Abbotsford, Chilliwack, while Vancouver Island includes Victoria, Duncan, Nanaimo, and Parksville.
144. Data on housing characteristics are available for free at www.statcan.ca. For data at the national, provincial, territorial or CMA level, click on "Canadian Statistics" and enter "dwelling type" into the search engine. Data for at all geographic levels, click on "Community Profiles".
145. Moveable dwelling refers to a single dwelling used as a place of residence but capable of being moved on short notice. Examples include mobile homes, tents, recreational vehicles, travel trailers or houseboats.
146. Depending on the size of the sample, these data may be available at the CMA level.
147. The crimes included in the measurement of household victimization are: break and enter; theft or attempted theft of motor vehicle or parts; theft or attempted theft of household property; and, vandalism.
148. Analysis in this section is largely based on data from Statistics Canada's 2003 General Social Survey on Social Engagement (cycle 17). For information at the provincial level, refer to Shellenberg, G. 2004 (July). *2003 General Social Survey on Social Engagement, cycle 17: an overview of findings*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 89-598-XIE (available free at www.statcan.ca). Depending on the sample size, data may also be produced at the CMA level.
149. This typology was developed by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).
150. The respondents to the 2003 GSS were asked questions about their "immediate neighbourhood". They were not provided a definition of the term, but based their answers on their own understanding.
151. A small proportion of respondents (2%) were unable or unwilling to answer.
152. Includes individuals who immigrated to Canada between 1990 and 2003.
153. According to the National Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada, 18% of newcomers could not speak English or French (Statistics Canada, 2003a). This is slightly higher than the proportion recorded in the 2001 Census, which showed that about 10% of immigrants who arrived in the 1990s did not know either official language (Statistics Canada, 2003f). In terms of mother tongue, the 2001 Census of population indicate that 79% of immigrants in the 1990s were allophones (mother tongue was neither English or French).
154. Excludes all those respondents who did not know or did not state their dwelling type or their familiarity with neighbours.
155. Data from the GSS were collected in 2003, and therefore, the most recent elections refer to the elections prior to data collection.
156. Youths were asked twenty-nine questions to assess their involvement in a number of generally unacceptable activities. For example, some of these activities included staying out all night without permission, running away from home, being questioned by the police, stealing, fighting, vandalism, carrying a knife, using drugs and arson. The youths were then asked whether they had been a part of a group that had done bad or risky things within the past year. These data are from 1996/97.
157. The 2004 GSS on Victimization included questions to measure social engagement. However, these data were not available in time to include a thorough analysis of the connection between social engagement and victimization in this report. A *Juristat* report dedicated to the analysis of 2004 GSS data on fear, crime and social context is planned for released during the fiscal year 2005/06.
158. Includes all respondents regardless of whether or not they walked alone in their neighbourhood after dark.
159. Future research could build on these results, by taking a multivariate approach using a multiple regression technique. Such analyses could study the effects of different factors, while controlling for the effects of others.
160. Refers to respondents who felt very safe or reasonably safe walking alone at night and who were not at all worried when home alone at night.

161. Participation in political activities refers to a 12-month period.
162. Refers to respondents who felt very safe or reasonably safe walking alone in their area in the evening or at night and who were not at all worried when home alone in the evening or at night.
163. Analysis in this section is based on Gannon, M. 2005. *General Social Survey on Victimization, Cycle 18: An Overview of Findings*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-565 (available free at www.statcan.ca). For data tables at the CMA level, refer to Statistics Canada. 2005. *General Social Survey - Cycle 18 Overview: Personal Safety and Perceptions of the Criminal Justice System*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-566 (available free at www.statcan.ca).
164. Also, see Criminal Intelligence Service of Canada, 2002.
165. The 12 major police forces that participated in the study include Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto, Halton Regional, Montreal, Regina, Windsor, Winnipeg, Sudbury, Ottawa, Waterloo, and the RCMP (RCMP data do not include British Columbia).
166. Family structure refers to the classification of census families into 'husband-wife' families where married or common-law couples live with or without sons or daughters, or lone-parent families that include either a male or female living with at least one son or daughter. Data on family structure are available for free at www.statcan.ca. For data at the national, provincial, territorial or CMA level, click on "Canadian statistics" and enter "family structure" into the search engine. For data at these and lower geographic levels, click on "Community profiles."
167. Data on the number of divorces for Canada, the provinces and territories are available for free at www.statcan.ca by clicking on "Canadian Statistics", then "Subject", then by entering "Divorce" into the search function. Historical data for these geographic levels are also available through CANSIM Table 053-0002. Population counts by marital status, including divorced, are available for all geographic levels at www.statcan.ca by clicking on "Community profiles".
168. This includes only divorce among marital relationships and does not include common-law relationships or separating couples. In the remaining divorces heard, custody arrangements were arrived at outside of court, or the divorcing couple did not have children.
169. These cases include only cases where there are dependents, marital relationships, common-law unions and separating and divorcing couples.
170. Participating jurisdictions in the 2003/04 Maintenance Enforcement Survey include Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.
171. These figures include cases that involve either just child support or support for both child and spouse.
172. Household refers to a person or a group of persons who occupy the same dwelling. The household may consist of a family group with or without other non-family persons; of two or more families sharing a dwelling; of a group of unrelated persons; or of one person living alone. A private household is a household occupying a private dwelling.
173. This section on spousal violence is based on analysis by Mihorean, K. 2005. "Trends in self-reported spousal violence" in K. AuCoin (ed.) *Family Violence in Canada, 2005*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Differences are statistically significant unless otherwise indicated in the text.
174. The difference between rates of spousal violence among women and men are not statistically different in any of the provinces.
175. For further information, refer to section B4.4 of this report.
176. The Canadian Incidence Study of Reported Child Abuse and Neglect was first conducted in 1998 by the Bell Canada Child Welfare Research Unit at the Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto, through funding from Health Canada. The results were published in 2001. The second cycle of the study was conducted in 2003 and the results were published in autumn 2005.
177. Unless otherwise specified in the text, the term "assaulted" comprises both physical and sexual assault.
178. Counts were not available for Quebec and Nunavut.
179. These totals are based on provincial and territorial counts published in *Child and Family Services Statistical Report, 1998-1999 to 2000-2001* by the Federal/Provincial Working Group on Child and Family Services Information (2005), Ottawa: Social Development of Canada (available free at www.sdc-dsc.ca under "social policy").
180. The authors of the analysis note that many sexual abuse cases where child protection is not at issue may be directed to the police rather than child welfare authorities and therefore would not have been present in this study.
181. Census data on the highest level of education attained are available for free at www.statcan.ca. For data at the national, provincial or territorial level, click on "Canadian Statistics", then enter "Education" into the search function. Population counts by education are available for all geographic levels for free at www.statcan.ca by clicking on "Community profiles".
182. The Youth in Transition Survey (YITS) is a longitudinal survey undertaken jointly by Statistics Canada and Human Resources and Skills Development Canada. Data were collected in 2000 from 15 and 18- to 20-year-olds, and these youth were re-interviewed in 2002 at ages 17 and 20 to 22, respectively.
183. A further 27% of dropouts cited a variety of other reasons.
184. Even when controlling for educational attainment among the different age cohorts, literacy skill differences remained. This suggests that literacy skills are linked to age independently from education. Results were similar for all the forms of literacy assessed by the Adult Literacy and Life Skill Survey.

185. For more information on the prevalence of learning disabilities, see Cossette and Duclos. 2001. *A Profile of Disability*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 89-577-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada (available free at www.statcan.ca); Moke, P. & J. Halloway. 1986. "Post secondary correctional education: Issues of functional illiteracy." *Journal of Correctional Education*. 37,1 : 18-22.; and, American Psychiatric Association, 1994. *Manual of Mental Disorders*, 4th Ed., DSM-IV.
186. Data for the 2002 CCHS was collected from May 2002 to December 2002 from 37,000 individuals, aged 15 and over. Respondents were classified as having a "substance dependence" if the pattern of answers met the criteria for either alcohol dependence, or illicit drug dependence. Indian reserves, full-time members of the Canadian Armed Forces, healthcare institutions and some remote areas are not included in the sample.
187. Regular heavy drinking is defined in the CCHS as the consumption of 5 or more drinks on one occasion, 12 or more times a year. Heavy drinking, in contrast, is defined as the consumption of 5 or more drinks on one occasion, less than 12 times a year.
188. These and other data from the four cycles of the Health Behaviours in School-Aged Children Study are available through the website for the Public Health Agency of Canada at www.phac-aspc.gc.ca.
189. Refer to section C2 Family of this report for analysis and data on this topic.
190. Analysis is based on incidents where there was only one offender and includes incidents of spousal physical and sexual assault.

References

- Agnew, R.F.T., S.V. Buron, T.D. Evans, and R.G. Dunaway. 1996. "A new test of classic strain theory" *Justice Quarterly*. 13: 681-704.
- American Probation and Parole Association. *Position Paper: Caseload Standards*. Available at <http://www.appa-net.org/about%20appa/caseload.htm>. Last accessed November 2005.
- American Psychiatric Association. 1994. *Manual of Mental Disorders*, 4th Ed., DSM-IV.
- Arboleda-Flórez, J., H.L. Holley and A. Crisanti. 1996. *Mental Illness and Violence: Proof or Stereotype?* Ottawa: Health Canada.
- AuCoin, K. 2003. "Violence and abuse against children and youth by family members." In Johnson, H. and K. AuCoin (eds). *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2003*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- AuCoin, K. 2005a. "Stalking – Criminal Harassment." In K. AuCoin (ed) *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2005*. Statistics Canada, catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- AuCoin, K. 2005b. "Children and Youth as Victims of Violent Crime." *Juristat* 25(1). Statistics Canada catalogue no 85-002-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- AuCoin, K. 2005c. "Family violence against older adults" in K. AuCoin (ed) *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2005*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Baily, W.C. 1984. "Poverty, inequality and city homicide rates: Some not so expected findings." *Criminology* 22: 531-550.
- Baldwin, J.R., M. Brown, J-P Maynard and D. Zietsma. 2004. "Catching up and Falling Behind: Performance of the Provincial DGP per Capita from 1990 to 2003." *Economic Analysis (EA) Research Paper Series*, no. 024. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 11-F0027MIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Basic Skills Agency. 1994. "Basic Skills in Prisons." London: The Basic Skills Agency.
- Barnes, S., and M. Kasse (eds.) 1979. *Political Action: Mass participation in five western societies*. California: Sage.
- Beattie, K. 2005. "Family violence against children and youth" in K. AuCoin (ed) *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2005*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Bélanger, A. and É. Caron Malenfant. 2005. "Population Projections of Visible Minority Groups: Canada, provinces and regions, 2001-2017." Statistics Canada catalogue no. 91-541-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Bell, K., E. Conrad and R. Suppra. 1984. "The findings and recommendations of the National Study on Learning Disabilities in Adult Inmates". *Journal of Correctional Education* 35(4): 129-136.
- Besserer, S. 2002. "Criminal Victimization: An international perspective." *Juristat* 22(4). Statistics Canada, catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Besserer, S. and D. Hendrick. 2001. "The risk of violent victimization." In Besserer, S. (ed). *A Profile of Criminal Victimization: Results of the 1999 General Social Survey*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-553-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Besserer, S. and C. Trainor. 2000. "Criminal Victimization in Canada, 1999." *Juristat*. 22(4). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002-XPE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Bernardini, S. and J. Jenkins. 2002. *An Overview of Risks and Protectors for Children's Outcomes: Children of Separation and Divorce*. Catalogue no. 2002-FCY-2E. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Blau, J.R. and P.M. Blau. 1986. "The cost of inequality: Metropolitan structure and criminal violence." *Sociological Quarterly* 27: 15-26.

- Boland, F., R. Burrill, M. Duwynand J. Karp. 1998. "Fetal Alcohol Syndrome: Implications for Correctional Service." *Research Report R-71*. Ottawa: Correctional Services Canada.
- Bollman, R. 2004. "Demography of Rural and Small Town Canada: An Update to 2001." Statistics Canada, internal document. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.
- Bonta, J., M. Dauvergne and T. Ruggae. 2003. *The Reconviction Rate of Federal Offenders*. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada.
- Bowlby, J.W. and K. McMullen. 2002. *At a Crossroads: Results of the First 18 to 20-year old Cohort of the Youth in Transition Survey*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-591-XIE. Ottawa: Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada.
- Brier, N. 1994. "Targeted treatment for adjudicated youth with learning disability: Effects on recidivism." *Journal of Learning Disability* 27(4): 215-222.
- British Columbia Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General. 2003. "For Your Protection: Peace Bonds and Restraining Orders." Available at http://www.pssg.gov.bc.ca/victim_services/publications/guides/PeaceBondsRestOrdersWEB.pdf. Accessed on February 17, 2005.
- Brooks, B. 2005. "Chronic unemployment: a statistical profile." *Analysis in Brief*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 11-162-MIE2005031. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Brown, S., B. Fisher, Y. Stys, C. Wilson and N. Crutcher. 2003. *Assisting Offenders with Learning Disabilities: An Evaluation of the Learning Strategies Classroom Pilot Project*. Correctional Services of Canada product no. 2003 R-141e. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Brzozowski, J-A. 2001. "Victimization in Urban and Rural Areas." In Besserer, S. (ed). *A Profile of Criminal Victimization: Results of the 1999 General Social Survey*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-553-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Brzozowski, J-A. 2004a. "Family Violence Against Older Adults." In Brzozowski, J-A. (ed). *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2004*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Brzozowski, J-A. 2004b. "Spousal Violence." In Brzozowski, J-A. (ed). *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2004*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Bursik, J.R. 1988. "Social disorganization and theories of crime and delinquency: problems and prospects" *Criminology* 25: 519-552.
- Canadian Federal-Provincial Task Force on Justice for Victims of Crime (1983). *Canadian Federal-Provincial Task Force on Justice for Victims of Crime Report*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services Canada.
- Carlson, B.E. 1991. "Outcomes of physical abuse and observation of marital violence among adolescents in placement." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 6: 526-534.
- Carrington, P.J. 2001. "Population aging and crime in Canada, 2000-2041." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 43: 331-356.
- Carrington, P.J. and J.L. Schulenberg. 2004. "Prior police contacts and police discretion with apprehended youth". *Crime and Justice Research Paper Series*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-561-MIE - No. 003. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Chapman, B. et al. 2002 (December). "Unemployment duration, schooling and property crime." *Crime and Justice Bulletin* 74. Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.
- Chapman, B. and S. Niven. 2000. *A Guide to the Criminal Justice System in England and Wales*. London: Home Office.
- Ciccione-McCutcheon, A. 2003. "Adult Criminal Court Statistics, 2002/03" *Juristat* 23(10). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Cloward, R. A. and L.E. Ohlin. 1960. *Delinquency and Opportunity*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Code, R. 2003. "Shelters for Abused Women and their Children." In Johnson, H. and K. AuCoin (eds). *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2003*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Cohen, L. and M. Felson. 1979. "Social change and crime rates trends: A routine activity approach." *American Sociological Review* 44: 588-608.
- Cohen, M. and H. Maclean. 2003. "Violence against Canadian women." *Women's Health Surveillance Report*. Ottawa: Health Canada. Available at www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/whsr-rssf/chap_21_e.html.

- Cormier, R.B. 2002. "Restorative justice: Directions and principles-developments in Canada." *User Report* Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada. Available at ww2.psepc-sppcc.gc.ca/publications/corrections/200202_e.esp.
- Cossette, L. and E. Duclos. 2004. *A Profile of Disability in Canada, 2001*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 89-577-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Cranswick, K. 2003. *General Social Survey Cycle 16: Caring for an Aging Society*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-582-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Criminal Intelligence Service Canada (CISC). 2002. *Annual Report on Organized Crime in Canada*. Catalogue no. JS61-8/2002. Ottawa: CISC.
- Currie, A. 1994. *Ethnocultural Groups and the Justice System in Canada: A Review of Issues*. Catalogue no. WD1994-5e. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada, Research and Statistics Division.
- Daly, M., Singh, L. and M. Wilson. 1993. "Children fathered by previous partners: A risk factor for violence against women." *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 84.
- Dauvergne, M. and H. Johnson. 2001. "Children witnessing family violence." *Juristat* 21(6). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002-XPE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- DeKeseredy, W.S. and M.D. Schwartz. 1996. *Contemporary Criminology*. New York: Wadsworth.
- Department of Justice Canada. 1997. *The Effects of Divorce on Children: Annotated Bibliography*. Catalogue no. WD1998-3e. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Department of Justice Canada. 2000. *Selected Statistics on Canadian Families and Family Law: Second Edition*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Department of Justice Canada. 2002. *Children Come First: A Report to Parliament Reviewing the Provisions and Operation of the Federal Child Support Guidelines*. Catalogue no. J2-186/2002-2E. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Department of Justice Canada. no date. "Fact Sheet: Restorative Justice." Available at <http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/ps/voc/pub.html>.
- Desjardins, N. and T. Hotton. 2004. "Trends in drug offences and the role of alcohol and drugs in crime." *Juristat* 25(1). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Desjardins, R., S. Murray, Y. Clermont and P. Werquin. *Learning a Living: First results of the Adult Literacy and Life Skills Survey*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 89-603-XWE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Ditton, P.M and D.J. Wilson, 1999. "Truth in sentencing in State Prison". *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*, NCJ 170032. Washington D.C: Office of Justice Programs, U.S Department of Justice.
- Doob, A.N. and J.V. Roberts. 1982. *Crime: Some Views of the Canadian Public*. Ottawa: Department of Justice.
- Dubé, V. 2004. "Sidelined in the labour market" *Perspectives*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 75-001-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Easterlin, R.A. 1987 *Birth and Fortune: The Impact of Numbers on Personal Welfare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2nd ed.
- Engler, C. and S. Crowe. 2000. "Alternative Measures in Canada, 1998-99" *Juristat* 20(6). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002-XPE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Ericson, R., P.M. Baranek and J.B.L. Chan. 1991. *Representing Order: Crime, Law and Criminal Justice in the News Media*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ferrer, A., D. Green and W. Riddell. 2004. "The Effects of Literacy on Immigrant Earnings." *International Literacy Survey Series*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 89-552-MIE2004012. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Fischer, C. 1975. "Toward a subcultural theory of urbanism." *American Journal of Sociology* 80(6).
- Fitzgerald, R. 2004. "An examination of sex differences in delinquency." *Crime and Justice Research Paper Series*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-561-MIE2003001. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Fitzgerald, R., M. Wisener and J.Savoie. 2004 "Neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime in Winnipeg." *Crime and Justice Research Paper Series*. Statistics Canada, catalogue no. 85-561-MIE2004004. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Frank, J. 2003. "Making social capital work for public policy" *Horizons* 6(3): 3-6. Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

- Franke, S. 2003. "Social Engagement in Canada: Statistics Canada's General Social Survey, Cycle 17." *Horizons* 6(3): 73-76. Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.
- Frederick, J. and J. East. 1999. "Eldercare in Canada: Who does how much?" *Canadian Social Trends*, Autumn, 1999. Statistics Canada catalogue no 11-008. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Gannon, M. 2005. "General Social Survey on Victimization, Cycle 18: An Overview of Findings." Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-565-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Gannon, M. and K. Mihorean 2005. "Criminal Victimization in Canada, 2004" *Juristat* 25(7). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Gittell, R. and A. Vidal. 1998. *Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Government of Canada. 1998. *A Voice Not a Veto: Report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights*.
- Green, D.A. and W.C. Riddell. 2001. "Literacy, numeracy and labour market outcomes." *International Adult Literacy Survey Series*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 89-552-MIE2001008. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Hagan, J. 1977. "Criminal justice in rural and urban communities: A study of the bureaucratization of justice." *Social Forces*. 55(3).
- Hagan J. and Ruth D. Peterson (eds). 1995. *Crime and Inequality*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Hartnagel, T. and G. Won Lee. 1990. "Urban crime in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 32: 591-606.
- Health Canada. 1999. *Trends in the Health of Canadian Youth*. Ottawa: Health Canada. Available at www.phac-aspc.gc.ca.
- Health Canada. n.d. *2001-02 Health Behaviours in School-aged Children Study: Questionnaire and Statistical Table*. Available at http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/dca-dea/publications/pdf/hbse_01_2candat.pdf.
- Health Canada. 2002. *A Report on Mental Illness in Canada*. Ottawa: Health Canada Editorial Board Mental Illnesses in Canada. Available at http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/miic-mmac/pdf/men_ill_e.pdf.
- Health Canada. 2003. *Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder: a framework for action*. Ottawa: Health Canada. Available at www.phac-aspc.gc.ca.
- Health Canada. 2004. "Child maltreatment: A public health issue." *Health Policy Research*. Issue 9, September 2004. Ottawa: Health Canada.
- Health Canada 2005. "Young people in Canada: their health and well-being." Ottawa: Health Canada. Available at www.phac-aspc.gc.ca.
- Hotton, T. and D. Haans. 2004. "Alcohol and drug use in early adolescence." *Health Reports* 15(3). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 82-003-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Hotton, T. 2002. "Spousal violence after marital separation." *Juristat* 21(7). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Hotton, T. 2003. "Childhood aggression and exposure to violence in the home." *Crime and Justice Research Paper Series*. Statistics Canada, catalogue no. 85-561-MIE2003002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Hou, F. 2004. "Recent immigration and the formation of visible minority neighbourhoods in Canada's large cities" *Analytical Studies Branch research paper series*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 11F0019MIE2004221. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Hsieh, C.C. and M.D. Pugh. 1993. "Poverty, income, inequality and violent crime: A meta-analysis of recent aggregate data studies." *Criminal Justice Review* 18:182-202.
- Humbert, C. and C. Raftas. 1996. *Fetal alcohol syndrome and other alcohol related birth defects*. Alberta: Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission.
- Insurance Bureau of Canada. 2002. *Facts of the General Insurance Industry in Canada, 2002*.
- Janhevich, D. 2001. "Hate Crime in Canada: An overview of issues and data sources". Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-551-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Jaffe, P.G, D. A. Wolfe and L. Zak. 1986. "Similarities in behavioural and social maladjustment among child victims and witnesses to family violence." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 56(1): 142-146.

- Janz, T. 2004. "Low-paid employment and 'Moving up'" *Income research paper series*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 75F0002MIE2004003. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Johnson, H. 1996. *Dangerous Domains: Violence Against Women in Canada*. Scarborough: Nelson Canada.
- Johnson, H. 1997. "Criminal Justice Indicators." (internal report) Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Johnson, S. 2005. "Returning to Correctional Services after release: A profile of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal adults involved in Saskatchewan Corrections from 1999/00 to 2003/04." *Juristat* 25(2). Statistics Canada, catalogue no. 85-002-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Johnson, S. 2004. "Adult Correctional Services in Canada, 2002/03" *Juristat* 24(10). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Johnson, S. 2003. "Custodial Remand in Canada, 1986/87 to 2000/01." *Juristat* 23(7). Statistics Canada, catalogue no. 85-002-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Kelly, Bess. 2005. "Legal Aid in Canada: Resource and Caseload Statistics, 2002/03." Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85F0015XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Kennedy, B.P., J. Kawachi and D. Prothrow-Stith. 1996. "Income distribution and mortality: Test of the Robin Hood Index in the United States." *British Medical Journal*, 312: 269-295.
- Kennedy, L. and D. Forde. 1990. "Routine activities and crime: An analysis of victimization in Canada." *Criminology* 28(1): 137-151.
- Kong, R. 2004. "Victim Services in Canada, 2002/03" *Juristat* 24(11). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Kong, R. and K. Beattie. 2005 *A Technical Report on Collecting Data on Aboriginal People in the Criminal Justice System*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-564-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Klymchuk, K.L., M. Cooper and K. Pacey. 2002. *Children exposed to partner violence: an overview of key issues*. Vancouver: BC Institute Against Family Violence.
- Krahn, H., T.F. Hartnagel and J.W. Gartrell. 1986. "Income inequality and homicide rates: Cross-national data and criminological theories." *Criminology* 24: 269-295.
- Kremavik, F. 2000. "The other side of the fence" *Canadian Social Trends*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 11-008. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Land, K., P. McCall and L. Cohen. 1990. "Structural covariates of homicide rates: Are there invariances across time and space?" *American Journal of Sociology* 95: 922-963.
- Leenaars, A. and Lester, D. 2004 "Understanding the declining Canadian homicide rate: A test of Holinger's relative cohort size hypothesis" *Death Studies* 28.
- Levitt, S. 1999. "The limited role of changing age structure in explaining aggregate crime rates." *Criminology* 37 (3): 581-597.
- Lipps, G. and J. Frank. 1997. "The National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth, 1994-95: Initial results from the school component." *Education Quarterly Review* 4(2). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 81-003-XPB. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Littell, J. and Wynn, J. 1989. *The availability and Use of Community Resources for Young Adolescents in an Inner City and a Suburban Community*. Chicago: Chapin Hall Centre for Children, University of Chicago.
- Locke, D. 2002. "Violence Against Children and Youth." In Trainor, (ed). *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2002*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Longworth, D. 2002 (spring). "Inflation and the Macroeconomy: Changes from the 1980s to the 1990s" *Bank of Canada Review*: 3-17. Ottawa.
- Marcil-Gratton, N. 1998. *Growing up with Mom and Dad? The Intricate Family Life Course of Canadian Children*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 89-566-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Marcil-Gratton, N. and C. Le Bourdais. 1999. *Custody, access and Child Support: Findings from the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth*. Catalogue no. CSR 1999-3E. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- McCaleb, A., Edgil, A. 1994. "Self-concept and self-care practices of healthy adolescents." *Journal of Paediatric Nursing* 9(4): 233-8.
- McCarthy, B. 1991. "Social structure, crime and social control: An examination of factors influencing rates and probabilities of arrest." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 19(1): 19-30.

- McMullen, K. 2004. "Literacy counts." *Education Matters: Insight on education, learning and training in Canada*. 81-004-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- McMullen, K. 2005. "Early indicators of students at risk of dropping out of high school." *Education Matters* 6. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 81-004-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Merton, R. 1938. "Social structure and anomie." *American Sociological Review* 3: 672-682.
- Messner, S.F. 1989. "Economic discrimination and societal homicide rates: Further evidence on the cost of inequality." *American Sociological Review* 54:597-611.
- Messner, S.F., L.E. Raffalovich and P. Shrock. 2002. "Reassessing the cross-national relationship between income inequality and homicide rates: Implications of data quality control in the measurement of income distribution." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 18(4): 377-395.
- Miethe, T. and R.Meier. 1990. "Opportunity choice and criminal victimization: A test of a theoretical model." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 27(3): 243-266.
- Mihorean, K. 2001. "The Risk of Violent Victimization." In Besserer, S. (ed). *A Profile of Criminal Victimization: Results of the 1999 General Social Survey*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-553-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Mihorean, K. 2005. "Trends in self-reported spousal violence" in K. AuCoin (ed) *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2005*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Mitten, Rae. 2004. "Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders and the Justice System." In *Commission on First Nations and Métis Peoples and Justice Reform 2*. Available at www.justicereformcomm.sk.ca.
- Moke, P. & J. Halloway (1986). "Post secondary correctional education: Issues of functional illiteracy." *Journal of Correctional Education* 37(1): 18-22.
- National Parole Board. 2003. *Performance Monitoring Report 2002/2003*. Ottawa: National Parole Board.
- National Parole Board. 2004. *Performance Monitoring Report 2003/2004*. Ottawa: National Parole Board.
- Nelson, J and G. Kiefl. 1995 "Survey of hate motivated activity" Catalogue no. TR1995-4e. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Neumayer, E. 2005. "Inequality and violent crime: Evidence from data on robbery and violent theft." *Journal of Peace Research* 42(1): 101-112.
- Ogrodnik, L. 2002. *Organized Crime in Canada: an Investigation into the Feasibility of Collecting Police-Level Data, 2002*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-556-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Ogg, S. 2001. "Perceptions and Fear of Crime". In Sandra Besserer (ed.) *A Profile of Criminal Victimization: Results of the 1999 General Social Survey*. Statistics Canada catalogue no.85-553. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Ouimet, M. 2002 "Explaining the American and Canadian Crime "drop" in the 1990's." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 44 (1), 33-50
- Park, J. 2003. "Adolescent self-concept and health into adulthood." *Health Reports*. Statistics Canada, catalogue no. 82-003-SIE2003000. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Parsons, S. 2002. "Basic skills and crime: Findings from a study of adults born in 1958 and 1970." London: The Basic Skills Agency.
- Pernanen, K., M. Cousineau, S. Brouchu, and F. Sun. 2002. *Proportion of Crimes Associated with Alcohol and Other Drugs in Canada*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse.
- Peters, A. 2002. "Is your community child-friendly?" *Canadian Social Trends*. Statistics Canada, catalogue no. 11-008. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Picot, G. and J. Myles. 1995. "Social transfers, changing family structure, and low income among children" *Analytical Studies Branch research paper series*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 11F0019MIE1995082. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Porporino, F.J. and D. Robinson. 1992. "The Correctional Benefits of Education." *Journal of Corrections Education* (43(2): 92-98.
- Pottie-Bunge, V. 2000. "Spousal Violence." In Pottie-Bunge, V and D. Locke (eds). *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2004*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Pottie-Bunge, V., H. Johnson and T. Baldé. 2005. "Exploring Crime Patterns in Canada." *Crime and Justice Research Paper Series*. Statistics Canada, catalogue no. 85-561-MIE2005005, Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

- Pronovost, I. 2005. *Child and Spousal Support: The Maintenance Enforcement Survey 2003/2004*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-228-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada. 2004. *Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview*. Catalogue no. PS4-12/2004. Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.
- Putnam, R. 2001. "Social Capital: Measurement and Consequences" *Isuma* 2(1): 41-51.
- Putnam, R. 2004. "Preface: Using Social Capital to Help Integrate Planning Theory, Research, and Practice" *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70(2): 142-143.
- Reitano, J. 2004. "Youth Custody and Community Services in Canada, 2002/03" *Juristat* 22(8). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- R. vs. Gladue*, [1999] 1 S.C.R. 688.
- Ristock, J. 1995. "The impact of violence on mental health: A guide to the literature." *Discussion Papers on Health/Family Violence*. Ottawa: Health Canada.
- Roberts, J.V. 1992. *Public opinion and sentencing: The surveys of the Canadian Sentencing Commission*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Roberts, J. V. and A. Edgar. 2002. *Victim Impact Statements at Sentencing: Perceptions of the Judiciary*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Roberts, J.V. and L.J. Stalans. 1997. *Public Opinion, Crime and Criminal Justice*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Roberts, T. 1992. *Assessment of the Victim Impact Statement in British Columbia*. Ottawa: Department of Justice.
- Robinson, P. 2004. "Youth Court Statistics, 2002/04" *Juristat* 24(2). Statistics Canada catalogue no.85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Rodgers, K., 1994. "The Generational Cycle of Family Violence" Paper prepared for presentation at the International Conference, Violence in the Family". Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Rogers, J.D. 1989. "Theories of crime and development: An historical perspective." *Journal of Developmental Studies* 25(3): 314-328.
- Rohe, W.M. 2004. "Building Social Capital through Community Development" *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70(2): 158-164.
- Sacco, V., H. Johnson and R. Arnold. 1993. "Urban-rural residence and criminal victimization." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 18(4): 433-453.
- Sampson, R.J. and J.H. Laub. 1990. "Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult bonds." *American Sociological Review* 55: 609-627
- Sampson, R.J. and J.H. Laub. 1993. *Crime in the Making: Pathways and turning points*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sampson, R.J. and S. Raudenbush. 2001. "Disorder in Urban Neighbourhoods – Does it Lead to Crime?" *Research Brief*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Sauvé, J. 1999. *Organized Crime Activity in Canada: A pilot survey of 16 police services*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-548-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Sauvé, J. 2005. "Crime Statistics in Canada, 2004." *Juristat* 25(5). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002-XPE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Savolainen, J. 2000. "Relative cohort size and age-specific arrest rates: a conditional interpretation of the Easterlin effect" *Criminology* 38(1). 117-136.
- Schellenberg, G. 2004. "2003 General Social Survey on Social Engagement, cycle 17: An overview of findings." Statistics Canada catalogue no. 89-598. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Secretariat to the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Working Group on Child and Family Services Information. 2002. *Child Welfare in Canada 2000*. Ottawa: Health Canada.
- Shaw, C. and H. McKay. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Silver, W., K. Mihorean, and A. Taylor-Butts. "Hate Crime in Canada". *Juristat* 24(4). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- South, S. and S.F. Messner. 2000. "Crime and demography: multiple linkages, reciprocal relations." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 83-106.

- Spencer, S.J., R.A Josephs., and CM, Steele, 1993. "Low self-esteem: the up hill struggle for self-integrity." In Baumeister. R.F. (ed). *Self-esteem: The Puzzle of Low Self-Regard*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Sprott, J.B. and Cesaroni, C. 2002. "Similarities in trends in homicide in the United States and Canada: Guns, crack or simple demographics?" *Homicide Studies* 6(4): 348-359.
- Square, D. 1997. "Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Epidemic in Manitoba Reserves." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 157(1): 59-60.
- Statistics Canada. 1999. "National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth: Transition into adolescence 1996-1997." *The Daily*. July 6. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2000. "*Women in Canada: A gender-based statistical report*." Catalogue no. 89-503-XPE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2001. "Seniors in Canada." *Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Profile Series*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85F0033MIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2002a. *Profile of languages in Canada: English, French and Many Others*. 2001 Census Analysis Series. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 96F0030XIE2001005. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2002b. "A Profile of the Canadian population: where we live" *2001 Census Analysis Series*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 96F0030. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2002c. "Changing Conjugal Life in Canada." Statistics Canada catalogue no. 89-576-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2002d. "Profile of Canadian Families and Households: Diversification Continues." Statistics Canada catalogue no. 96F0030XIE2001003. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2002e. "Vital Statistics, 2002." Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2003a. "Census of population: Immigration, birthplace and birthplace of parents, citizenship, ethnic origin, visible minorities and Aboriginal peoples." *The Daily*. January 21. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2003b. *Population Projections of Visible Minority Groups, Canada, Provinces and Regions*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 91-541-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2003c "Aboriginal peoples of Canada: A demographic profile." Statistics Canada catalogue no. 96F0030XIE2001007. *Census Analysis Series*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2003d. "Ethnic Diversity Study" *The Daily*. September 29. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2003e. "Update on cultural diversity" *Canadian Social Trends*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 11-008-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2003f. "Canada's ethnocultural portrait: The changing mosaic." *2001 Census Analysis Series*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 96F0030XIE2001008. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2003g. "Canada e-book, online version of 2001 Canada Year Book." Statistics Canada catalogue no. 11-404. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada, 2003h. *Education Indicators in Canada: Report of the Pan-Canadian Education Indicators Program*. Statistics Canada catalogue number 81-582-XIE. Ottawa.
- Statistics Canada. 2003i. "Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada" *The Daily*. September 4. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.
- Statistics Canada. 2003j. "Update on Families." *Canadian Social Trends* 69. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 11-008. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2003k. "Canadian Community Health Survey: Mental health and well-being." *The Daily*. September 3. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2004a (December 11). *Labour Force Information*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 71-001-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2004b. "Divorces." *The Daily*. May 4. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.
- Statistics Canada. 2005a. *General Social Survey, Cycle 18 Overview: personal safety and perceptions of the criminal justice system*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-566. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2005b. "Canadian economic accounts, 2004." *The Daily*. February 28. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2005c. "Provincial and territorial economic accounts, 2004." *The Daily*. April 27. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

- Statistics Canada. 2005d. *Income in Canada, 2003*. Statistics Canada datalogue no. 75-202XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. 2005e. "Divorces, 2003." *The Daily*. March 9. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada and the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). 2003. *Education Indicators in Canada: Report of the Pan-Canadian Education Indicators Program 2003*. Statistics Canada catalogue no.81-582. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Steffensmeier, D. and D. Harder. 1999. "Making sense of recent US crime trends, 1980 to 1996/1998: Age composition effects and other explanations" *Journal of Research in crime and Delinquency* 36(3): 235-274.
- Stevens, D.J., 2001. "Education programming for offenders-Chapter from Correctional Service of Canada (CSC)". *Compendium 2001 on effective correctional programming*. Ottawa: Correctional Services Canada. Available at www.csc-scc.gc/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_9_e.shtml.
- Stewart, R. 2001. "The Early Identification and Streaming of Cases of High Conflict Separation and Divorce: A Review." Catalogue no. 2001-FCY-7E. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Stone, W., M. Gray, and J. Hughes. 2003. "Social Capital as Work: An Australian example" *Horizons*. 6(3): 55-60.
- Streissguth, A. P. 2001. *Fetal Alcohol Syndrome: A guide for families and communities*. Toronto: Paul Brookes Publishing Company.
- Surette, R. 1998. *Media, Crime and Criminal Justice: Images and Realities*. New York: Wadsworth.
- Tait, C.L. 2002. *Fetal Alcohol Syndrome among Canadian Aboriginal Peoples: Review and analysis of the intergenerational links to residential schools*. Montreal: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Taylor-Butts, A. 2005. "Canada's Shelters for Abused Women, 2003/04." *Juristat* 25(3). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Thomas, J. 2005, "Youth Court Statistics, 2003/04." *Juristat* 25(4). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Thomas, M. 2004 "Adult Criminal Court Statistics, 2003/04." *Juristat* 24(12). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Thomas, M., H. Hurley and C. Grimes. 2002. "Pilot Analysis of Recidivism Among Convicted Youth and Young Adults, 1999/00." *Juristat* 22(9). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Trainor, C. 2001. "Victims' Use of Justice and Social Services." In Besserer, S. (ed). *A Profile of Criminal Victimization: Results of the 1999 General Social Survey*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-553. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Trainor, C and K. Mihorean (eds). 2001. *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2001*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.
- Troc me, N. and D. Wolfe. 2001. *Child Maltreatment in Canada: Canadian Incidence Study of Reported Child Abuse and Neglect Selected Results*. Catalogue no. H49-152/2000E. Ottawa: Health Canada.
- Trevethan, S. et al. 1999. "A One-Day Snapshot of Inmates in Canada's Adult Correctional Facilities." *Juristat* 18(8). Statistics Canada catalogue no 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Tufts, J. "Public Attitudes Toward the Criminal Justice System." *Juristat* 20(12). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Turpel-Lafond, M.E. 1999. "Sentencing within a restorative justice paradigm: procedural implications of R. v. Gladue" *The Criminal Law Quarterly* 43(1): 34-50.
- Vidal, A.C. 2004. "Building Social Capital to Promote Community Equity" *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70(2): 164-168.
- Wallace, M. 2005. "Crime Statistics in Canada". *Juristat* 25(5). Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-002-XPE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Wallace, M. 2004. *Exploring the Involvement of Organized Crime in Motor Vehicle Theft*. Statistics Canada catalogue no. 85-563-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Walmsley, R. 2003. "World prison population list (fifth edition)". *Research findings* no 234. United Kingdom: Home Office Research.
- Wekerle, C. et al. 2004. "Substance Abuse and Child Maltreatment." *Health Policy Research*, 9. Ottawa: Health Canada.

- Widom, C. and M. Maxfield. 2001. "An update on the cycle of violence." *Research in Brief*. National Institute of Justice. Washington D.C: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Wilson, W.J. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wirth, Louise. 1938. "Urbanization as a way of life." *The American Journal of Sociology* 44: 1-24.
- Woldoff, R. A. 2002. "The effects of local stressors on neighborhood attachment" *Social Forces* 18(1): 87-117.
- Woolcock, M. 2001. "The Place of Social Capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes" *Isuma*. 2.1: 11-17.
- Workers' Compensation Board of British Columbia and the Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General. 2002. *Criminal Injury Compensation Program Report 2001*. Vancouver: Worker's Compensation Board of British Columbia and the Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General.
- Young, A.N. 2001. *The Role of the Victim in the Criminal Process: A Literature Review*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.

Appendix D Data Framework for Justice Statistics and Analysis

