

Catalogue no. 85-228-X

Child and Spousal Support: Maintenance Enforcement Survey Statistics



2007/2008



Statistics
Canada

Statistique
Canada

Canada

How to obtain more information

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

Statistics Canada's National Contact Centre

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

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

Local or international calls:

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

Depository Services Program

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

To access this product

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

Standards of service to the public

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

Statistics Canada
Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics

Child and Spousal Support: Maintenance Enforcement Survey Statistics

2007/2008

Published by authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada

© Minister of Industry, 2009

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

March 2009

Catalogue no. 85-228-X

ISSN 1708-0436

Frequency: Annual

Ottawa

La version française de cette publication est disponible sur demande (n° 85-228-X 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.

User information

Symbols

The following standard symbols are used in Statistics Canada publications:

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

Table of contents

Highlights	5
Introduction	6
A description of maintenance enforcement services	7
Related products	10
Statistical tables	
1 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by interjurisdictional support order status, by fiscal year	12
2 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, April 2003 to March 2008	13
3 Maintenance enforcement cases administered, by new enrollments, re-enrollments and closed cases, by fiscal year	14
4 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by length of enrolment, by fiscal year	15
5 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by authority of order/agreement and type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2008	16
6 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by sex of payor and recipient, at March 31	17
7 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by median age of payor, recipient and children, at March 31	18
8 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by assignment status, at March 31	19
9 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by regular monthly payment due, at March 31	20
10 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled and regular monthly median payment due, by type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2008	21
11 Maintenance enforcement cases administered with a regular amount due, by amount due and received by fiscal year	22
12 Maintenance enforcement cases administered, by total amount due and received, 2007/2008	23
13 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by regular monthly payment due and proportion in compliance, at March 31	24
14 Maintenance enforcement cases in compliance with regular payments due, by type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2008	25
15 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by compliance on regular monthly payments due, at month end	26
16 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled for entire fiscal year, by regularity of monthly compliance	27
17 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by arrears history and status, at March 31, 2008	28
18 Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by amount owing, at March 31	29
19 Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by percentage received of regular monthly payment due, at March 31	30

Table of contents – continued

20	Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by elapsed time since last payment, at March 31	31
21	Number and type of enforcement actions for maintenance enforcement cases administered, 2007/2008	32

Data quality, concepts and methodology

	Methodology	33
--	-------------	----

Appendix

I	Glossary of terms	37
---	-------------------	----

Highlights

- On March 31, 2008, 404,000 cases, most involving children, were registered in Maintenance Enforcement Programs (MEPs) in the eight provinces and two territories reporting data. The number of cases enrolled remained stable from the previous year.
- In March 2008, the median amount of the regular payment due ranged from \$200 in New Brunswick to \$369 in the Northwest Territories.
- The majority of cases registered with a MEP are in full compliance with their regular monthly payment in any given month. In March 2008, the proportion of cases in compliance was 66% in the reporting provinces and territories, ranging from 55% in the Northwest Territories to 77% in Quebec.
- Compared to the previous year, the average monthly compliance rate remained stable in almost all jurisdictions in 2007/2008.
- Cases do not necessarily remain in compliance throughout the year. For the five jurisdictions reporting these data (Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories), in just over one-third of cases, payors made their regular payment in full every month in 2007/2008, and in nearly two-thirds of cases, payors made their payment in full at least 6 months of the year.
- A majority of cases (62%) already had arrears owing when they enrolled in a MEP. As of March 2008, inherited arrears (arrears that existed before enrolment) had been paid off or reduced in about two-thirds of cases with these arrears.
- On March 31, 2008, 64% of cases had arrears. Quebec had the lowest proportion of cases with arrears (43%) and Ontario the highest (77%). Total arrears owing was \$2.5 billion for the 10 reporting jurisdictions, up 3% from the previous year.
- In 2007/2008, nearly 360,000 enforcement actions were initiated in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, and the Northwest Territories. Tracing, initiating garnishments, and demands for information or payment comprised the majority of actions in most jurisdictions.

Introduction

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

MEPs play an important role in the area of spousal and child support in Canada. Between 2001 and 2006, there were two million cases of divorce or separation in the ten provinces (General Social Survey, 2006). While not all of these cases end up with a support order that is registered with a MEP, many will.

This report provides data on the characteristics of cases that are registered with the MEPs.¹ The results presented in this report comprise child and spousal support data for eight provinces and two territories, representing 95% of Canada's population. Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia provide data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey (MES), while Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report to the newer, more detailed Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs (SMEP).² Newfoundland and Labrador, Manitoba and Nunavut currently do not report. Some data tables do not include all jurisdictions from the MES because the data are not available.

1. Readers should be cautious in using the survey data to evaluate specific Maintenance Enforcement Programs or to generalize the results to all support orders in Canada. The MEPs across Canada differ in a number of important aspects because of different local needs and policies. These differences include client profile, enforcement powers in legislation, enforcement practices, the enrolment process, how payments are handled and registered, the responsibilities of clients, and how cases are closed.
2. For more information about the differences between the two surveys, refer to the Methodology Section. New Brunswick provided data for the SMEP for March 2008 and are included in some of the tables.

A description of maintenance enforcement services

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

Registration

All support recipients with an enforceable court order or agreement¹ can avail themselves of the services of a maintenance enforcement program. However, not all cases of child and spousal support that exist in a province or territory are administered by maintenance enforcement programs (General Social Survey, 2006).

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

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

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

Payment processing

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

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

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

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

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

Enforcement

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

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

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

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

The federal government provides assistance to the enforcement efforts of the MEPs. The Family Law Assistance Services Section of the federal Department of Justice provides access to federal databases in order to search for payors,⁴ and allows for the interception of federal funds⁵ and the denial/suspension of federally administered licenses including passports (*Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act*). Under the *Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act (GAPDA)*, federal employee salaries and pensions are subject to garnishment.

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

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

- Nova Scotia charges penalties and fees for non-sufficient funds (NSF) cheques, the issuance of a garnishment, and the revocation of motor vehicle privilege. There is also an annual administrative default fee of \$213.
- In New Brunswick, pursuant to the provincial *Support Enforcement Act* proclaimed in 2008, fees are charged to payors on some enforcement actions taken by the MEP, including tracing (both provincial and federal), issuing garnishments and holding a default hearing. A fee is also charged for NSF items and other dishonoured payments.
- In Quebec, the MEP charges for NSF cheques and applies collection charges for unpaid demands for payment.
- Deterrent penalties and service fees are being phased-in in Alberta. In the first phase, beginning November 2005, three penalties were introduced: a default penalty for late or missed payments, a penalty for NSF items and a penalty for failure to file a Statement of Finances.

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

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

- British Columbia introduced a default fee in 1998/1999. Each year the payor is charged the equivalent of one month's maintenance, to a maximum of \$400, upon the second default of the year.

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

Case closure

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

Payors can also withdraw from the program, but under limited circumstances. In particular, this is allowed in New Brunswick and Ontario, provided the recipient is in agreement; in British Columbia, if the payor was the one who registered the order and the recipient is in agreement; and in Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories, if the payor was the one who registered the order. In Quebec, the payor and the recipient can jointly apply to the Court for an exemption from having the MEP administer their case. In order for the Court to agree, the payor must provide the MEP with security (a sum of money, a letter of guarantee or a guarantee from a financial institution) covering payment of support for one month.

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

Related products

Selected publications from Statistics Canada

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

Selected surveys from Statistics Canada

3324 Maintenance Enforcement Survey

Statistical tables

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

	Cases enrolled		Non-interjurisdictional support order	Interjurisdictional support order-in	Interjurisdictional support order-out
	number	percent			
Prince Edward Island 1, 2					
2003/2004	2,571	100	85	11	4
2004/2005	2,568	100	85	11	4
2005/2006	2,676	100	85	11	4
2006/2007	2,730	100	84	11	5
2007/2008	4,014	100	81	12	7
Nova Scotia 1					
2003/2004
2004/2005	20,526	100	83	6	11
2005/2006	20,580	100	82	6	12
2006/2007	19,968	100	82	6	12
2007/2008	19,482	100	81	6	13
New Brunswick 1					
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008	14,028	100	84	6	10
Quebec 3					
2003/2004	121,464	100	98	1	1
2004/2005	125,652	100	98	1	1
2005/2006	129,390	100	98	1	1
2006/2007	132,177	100	98	1	1
2007/2008	133,251	100	98	1	1
Saskatchewan					
2003/2004	9,663	100	68	13	19
2004/2005	9,675	100	67	13	19
2005/2006	9,366	100	69	13	19
2006/2007	9,156	100	70	13	18
2007/2008	9,159	100	69	14	17
Alberta 1					
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006	50,271	100	75	16	9
2006/2007	48,897	100	75	17	9
2007/2008	48,558	100	74	17	9
British Columbia					
2003/2004	46,191	100	77	9	14
2004/2005	45,132	100	77	9	14
2005/2006	44,544	100	77	9	14
2006/2007	43,578	100	77	9	14
2007/2008	43,416	100	78	9	14
Yukon 1					
2003/2004	591	100	39	32	29
2004/2005	603	100	40	32	28
2005/2006	582	100	44	28	28
2006/2007	555	100	43	29	28
2007/2008	552	100	44	29	27
Northwest Territories 1					
2003/2004
2004/2005	855	100	47	29	24
2005/2006	816	100	50	27	23
2006/2007	858	100	51	26	23
2007/2008	870	100	54	25	21

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

2. In March 2008, Prince Edward Island began reporting data through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Program includes data not only on active cases in the Prince Edward Island system, but also on a substantial number of inactive cases. Prince Edward Island has a practice of making cases inactive rather than closing them, thus their inactive caseload is much higher than other jurisdictions. In most other tables in this report, with the exception of table 3, only active cases are reported on.

3. In Quebec, cases enrolled in the annual tables include direct payment cases. Direct payments are defined as payments made by the payor to the recipient which do not involve the maintenance enforcement program. Other annual tables are tables 3, 4, and 16.

Note(s): Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. The provinces and territories have enacted legislation to ensure that orders/agreements can be enforced beyond their borders. Non-interjurisdictional support order cases are typically cases where both parties live in the same province/territory. Interjurisdictional support order-in cases are cases that the province/territory has been asked by another jurisdiction to enforce because the payor lives and/or has assets inside their borders. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are cases that the province/territory has sent to another jurisdiction for enforcement because the payor lives and/or has assets outside their borders.

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

Table 2
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, April 2003 to March 2008

	Cases enrolled												Average ¹
	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	
	number												
Prince Edward Island²													
2003/2004	2,319	2,340	2,343	2,364	2,364	2,400	2,418	2,424	2,442	2,430	2,451	2,460	2,396
2004/2005	2,481	2,481	2,499	2,508	2,343	2,349	2,364	2,394	2,400	2,430	2,439	2,457	2,429
2005/2006	2,469	2,511	2,502	2,523	2,547	2,514	2,547	2,535	2,565	2,550	2,559	2,571	2,533
2006/2007	2,580	2,568	2,568	2,565	2,535	2,553	2,559	2,559	2,565	2,586	2,580	2,598	2,568
2007/2008	2,595	2,592	2,589	2,595	2,595	2,595	2,574	2,589	2,565	2,577	2,547	2,538	2,579
Nova Scotia²													
2003/2004
2004/2005	18,249	18,282	18,231	18,240	18,285	18,267	18,189	..
2005/2006	18,228	18,207	18,204	18,171	18,207	18,207	18,225	18,204	18,132	18,144	18,183	18,177	18,191
2006/2007	18,207	18,120	18,120	18,024	17,940	17,811	17,730	17,748	17,631	17,661	17,691	17,577	17,855
2007/2008	17,571	17,532	17,451	17,355	17,283	17,277	17,241	17,217	17,208	17,175	17,043	16,965	17,277
New Brunswick³													
2003/2004	13,155	13,197	13,227	13,314	13,374	13,389	13,449	13,485	13,518	13,515	13,536	13,536	13,391
2004/2005	13,482	13,506	13,488	13,515	13,446	13,434	13,308	13,215	13,083	13,002	12,996	12,987	13,289
2005/2006	12,972	12,936	12,912	12,909	12,873	12,876	12,846	12,840	12,831	12,855	12,840	12,807	12,875
2006/2007	12,828	12,813	12,822	12,840	12,837	12,837	12,837	12,825	12,834	12,864	12,852	12,840	12,836
2007/2008	12,867	12,891	12,897	12,687	..
Quebec													
2003/2004	99,075	99,552	99,696	100,029	100,299	100,587	100,677	100,878	101,238	101,682	102,000	102,339	100,671
2004/2005	102,522	102,792	102,846	102,888	103,035	103,218	103,095	103,344	103,611	103,755	104,082	104,385	103,298
2005/2006	104,670	104,847	105,063	105,270	105,600	105,669	105,735	105,861	106,122	106,230	106,425	106,227	105,643
2006/2007	106,395	106,602	106,458	106,587	106,752	106,593	106,575	106,674	106,764	106,929	106,977	107,070	106,698
2007/2008	107,025	107,034	107,031	107,175	107,400	106,968	106,917	106,863	106,407	106,167	106,485	106,512	106,832
Ontario													
2003/2004	172,935	173,346	173,532	173,502	174,159	174,744	175,794	176,175	176,700	177,492	177,690	176,730	175,233
2004/2005	176,769	176,397	176,418	177,036	177,120	177,231	177,948	177,933	178,122	178,326	178,542	178,251	177,508
2005/2006	178,662	178,680	179,154	179,517	179,838	180,090	180,429	180,942	180,966	181,032	180,192	175,005	179,542
2006/2007	172,398	169,524	168,306	167,394	167,202	168,411	168,669	168,702	168,786	169,974	169,845	170,826	169,170
2007/2008	171,180	171,549	172,008	172,137	172,488	173,121	173,346	173,850	173,955	174,159	174,468	175,062	173,110
Saskatchewan													
2003/2004	7,680	7,725	7,752	7,758	7,809	7,818	7,866	7,827	7,824	7,857	7,854	7,848	7,802
2004/2005	7,800	..	7,809	7,860	7,908	7,893	7,848	7,887	7,875	7,875	7,863	7,791	7,855
2005/2006	7,767	7,740	7,773	7,761	7,794	7,737	7,752	7,725	7,770	7,737	7,653	7,635	7,737
2006/2007	7,602	7,572	7,608	7,557	7,596	7,593	7,596	7,620	7,695	7,644	7,545	7,548	7,598
2007/2008	7,542	7,539	7,524	7,590	7,653	7,707	7,584	7,644	7,629	7,632	7,593	7,614	7,604
Alberta²													
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006	46,578	47,043	47,607	46,977	46,170	46,143	46,125	46,107	46,110	46,083	46,062	45,963	46,414
2006/2007	45,903	45,612	45,393	45,288	45,138	45,078	45,021	44,826	44,793	44,721	44,694	44,619	45,091
2007/2008	44,637	44,457	44,361	44,244	44,076	44,085	43,998	43,992	44,013	43,953	44,031	44,175	44,169
British Columbia													
2003/2004	39,957	39,912	39,924	39,888	39,741	39,684	39,708	39,771	39,792	39,792	39,789	39,774	39,811
2004/2005	39,753	39,732	39,552	39,396	39,273	39,144	39,039	38,928	38,895	38,901	38,958	38,814	39,199
2005/2006	38,712	38,661	38,637	38,601	38,532	38,514	38,460	38,493	38,499	38,496	38,394	38,355	38,530
2006/2007	38,433	38,355	38,316	38,229	38,055	37,914	37,785	37,698	37,680	37,647	37,650	37,572	37,945
2007/2008	37,509	37,488	37,494	37,527	37,479	37,584	37,536	37,650	37,620	37,635	37,674	37,536	37,561
Yukon²													
2003/2004	414	423	429	423	429	432	420	432	432	426	426	420	426
2004/2005	420	408	414	432	423	414	411	417	420	426	438	438	422
2005/2006	432	429	438	444	435	432	423	426	423	423	414	423	429
2006/2007	417	414	408	411	408	402	417	393	387	390	396	402	404
2007/2008	402	399	387	396	396	396	396	396	396	399	396	414	398
Northwest Territories²													
2003/2004
2004/2005	654	..
2005/2006	645	648	642	648	639	642	636	636	636	627	621	627	637
2006/2007	633	645	657	660	663	675	657	642	651	657	657	654	654
2007/2008	663	666	684	681	690	681	690	690	684	690	690	684	683

- The average monthly caseload for the year is calculated by taking the sum of the monthly figures and dividing by 12. In certain instances, monthly average caseload is calculated using 11 months of data if caseload data from one month are not available.
- Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
- New Brunswick converted to a new information system in February 2008 and a new interface to the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs was built for the new system. Data collected the first few months of 2007/2008 was through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey. Data for March 2008 was collected through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

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

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

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

	Cases administered ¹		New enrolments		Re-enrollments ²		Closed cases ³	
	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent
Prince Edward Island ⁴								
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008	3,735	171	5	0	0	21	1	
Nova Scotia ⁴								
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006	20,718	2,166	10	612	3	2,547	12	
2006/2007	20,430	1,953	10	561	3	2,859	14	
2007/2008	19,629	1,818	9	537	3	2,664	14	
Quebec ⁵								
2003/2004	127,026	14,490	11	987	1	7,023	6	
2004/2005	131,097	12,969	10	900	1	7,029	5	
2005/2006	135,606	13,149	10	981	1	7,746	6	
2006/2007	138,744	12,096	9	999	1	8,061	6	
2007/2008	139,986	12,108	9	996	1	8,241	6	
Saskatchewan								
2003/2004	8,808	846	10	210	2	969	11	
2004/2005	8,910	810	9	192	2	1,116	13	
2005/2006	8,724	684	8	192	2	1,095	13	
2006/2007	8,634	741	9	174	2	1,083	13	
2007/2008	8,682	852	10	174	2	1,077	12	
Alberta ⁴								
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006	54,417	6,468	12	2,121	4	8,445	16	
2006/2007	51,360	4,398	9	2,034	4	6,741	13	
2007/2008	50,004	4,632	9	1,980	4	5,835	12	
British Columbia								
2003/2004	45,072	4,593	10	678	2	5,298	12	
2004/2005	43,959	3,654	8	609	1	5,151	12	
2005/2006	43,455	4,107	9	642	1	5,109	12	
2006/2007	42,357	3,555	8	558	1	4,797	11	
2007/2008	41,955	3,774	9	588	1	4,422	11	
Yukon ⁴								
2003/2004	483	54	11	21	4	66	14	
2004/2005	507	72	14	27	5	72	14	
2005/2006	504	57	11	21	4	84	17	
2006/2007	486	60	12	18	4	87	18	
2007/2008	474	54	11	30	6	69	15	
Northwest Territories ^{4, 6}								
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006	714	78	11	12	2	87	12	
2006/2007	720	117	16	12	2	63	9	
2007/2008	741	111	15	9	1	54	7	

1. This is the number of cases enrolled for all or part of the fiscal year. This figure may be undercounted, as it does not include non-interjurisdictional support order cases that become interjurisdictional support order-outs during the year.
2. Re-enrollments are cases that were not enrolled in the Maintenance Enforcement Program at the beginning of the fiscal year, but re-enrolled at some point during the year. Cases that were newly enrolled, withdrawn then re-enrolled all in the same year are categorized as re-enrollments only.
3. Closed cases are cases that terminated or withdrew from the Maintenance Enforcement Program during the fiscal year and did not re-enrol.
4. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
5. In Quebec, cases enrolled in the annual tables include direct payment cases. Direct payments are defined as payments made by the payor to the recipient which do not involve the maintenance enforcement program. Other annual tables are tables 3, 4, and 16.
6. In the Northwest Territories, totals for closed cases and cases administered are undercounted.

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

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

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

	Cases enrolled		Length of time enrolled							
	number		Less than	Greater than	Greater	Greater	Greater	Greater	Greater	
			or equal to 1 year	1 year to 3 years	than 3 to 5 years	than 5 to 7 years	than 7 to 10 years	than 10 to 15 years	than 15 years	
		percent								
Prince Edward Island¹										
2003/2004	2,466	100	9	20	16	17	20	16	3	
2004/2005	2,454	100	10	17	18	14	20	17	4	
2005/2006	2,553	100	8	17	17	14	21	18	5	
2006/2007	2,583	100	7	15	16	15	19	21	7	
2007/2008	2,538	100	6	13	15	16	19	22	8	
Nova Scotia^{1, 2}										
2003/2004	
2004/2005	18,174	100	8	14	15	13	50	
2005/2006	18,177	100	8	14	13	13	23	28	..	
2006/2007	17,568	100	8	14	13	13	19	33	..	
2007/2008	16,962	100	7	14	13	12	18	37	..	
New Brunswick¹										
2003/2004	
2004/2005	
2005/2006	
2006/2007	
2007/2008	12,687	100	9	15	14	13	19	22	7	
Quebec^{2, 3}										
2003/2004	120,003	100	12	25	29	24	10	
2004/2005	124,068	100	11	22	23	25	19	
2005/2006	127,860	100	10	20	20	23	27	
2006/2007	130,683	100	9	18	18	19	28	7	..	
2007/2008	131,745	100	9	18	16	17	27	14	..	
Saskatchewan⁴										
2003/2004	7,833	100	10	16	15	13	30	14	2	
2004/2005	7,791	100	10	18	14	13	26	17	2	
2005/2006	7,620	100	8	19	13	13	24	20	3	
2006/2007	7,554	100	9	16	15	12	17	27	4	
2007/2008	7,602	100	10	16	15	11	16	26	5	
Alberta¹										
2003/2004	
2004/2005	
2005/2006	45,969	100	9	17	15	12	17	21	10	
2006/2007	44,613	100	9	17	14	12	16	21	11	
2007/2008	44,169	100	9	16	15	13	15	20	12	
British Columbia										
2003/2004	39,783	100	11	20	19	16	16	17	1	
2004/2005	38,814	100	9	19	18	17	18	15	3	
2005/2006	38,349	100	10	17	16	16	20	16	5	
2006/2007	37,563	100	9	16	16	15	20	17	6	
2007/2008	37,533	100	10	16	14	14	20	18	7	
Yukon¹										
2003/2004	414	100	12	16	19	16	20	17	..	
2004/2005	435	100	14	16	16	16	20	19	..	
2005/2006	417	100	10	20	13	16	19	17	5	
2006/2007	399	100	13	20	12	12	20	20	5	
2007/2008	399	100	13	17	14	11	19	20	7	
Northwest Territories¹										
2003/2004	
2004/2005	657	100	15	20	19	14	17	13	1	
2005/2006	630	100	12	23	19	15	15	15	1	
2006/2007	654	100	17	22	15	15	15	16	1	
2007/2008	690	100	15	21	17	13	13	17	3	

1. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
 2. In Nova Scotia and Quebec, length of time enrolled does not exceed 12 years because in 1996 the Maintenance Enforcement Program information systems were implemented by the Nova Scotia Department of Justice and the Ministère du Revenu du Québec, and the date of enrolment for previously enrolled cases was set to 1996.
 3. In Quebec, cases enrolled include direct payment cases. Direct payments are defined as payments made by the payor to the recipient which do not involve the Maintenance Enforcement Program.
 4. In Saskatchewan in 1997, an increase in staff, judges, and the introduction of the Child Support Guidelines may have increased the number of cases processed in that year. In 2003/2004, this corresponds with cases of 7 to 10 years duration, and in 2006/2007 it corresponds with cases of 10 to 15 years duration.
- Note(s):** Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables.
- Source(s):** Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 5
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by authority of order/agreement and type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2008

	Cases enrolled		Authority of order or agreement							
	number	percent	Divorce Act		Provincial order		Provincial agreement		Unknown	
			number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent
Nova Scotia ^{1, 2}										
Children only	15,177	100	4,050	27	11,127	73
Spouse only	843	100	441	52	402	48
Spouse with children	717	100	459	64	258	36
Unknown	222	100	54	24	168	76
Total	16,965	100	5,004	29	11,961	71
New Brunswick ²										
Children only	11,307	100	2,439	22	7,497	66	27	0	1,344	12
Spouse only	504	100	294	58	174	35	0	0	36	7
Spouse with children	276	100	99	36	150	54	3	1	24	9
Unknown	606	100	69	11	198	33	0	0	339	56
Total	12,693	100	2,901	23	8,019	63	30	0	1,743	14
Saskatchewan										
Children only	6,486	100	2,448	38	3,039	47	399	6	600	9
Spouse only	204	100	150	74	21	10	9	4	24	12
Spouse with children	354	100	258	73	63	18	12	3	21	6
Unknown	573	100	276	48	165	29	21	4	111	19
Total	7,617	100	3,132	41	3,288	43	441	6	756	10
Alberta ²										
Children only	31,812	100	12,057	38	15,852	50	3,903	12	0	0
Spouse only	1,101	100	1,002	91	99	9	0	0	0	0
Spouse with children	855	100	699	82	153	18	3	0	0	0
Unknown	10,398	100	72	1	27	0	9	0	10,290	99
Total	44,166	100	13,830	31	16,131	37	3,915	9	10,290	23
British Columbia										
Children only	34,821	100	7,503	22	24,900	72	2,370	7	48	0
Spouse only	831	100	414	50	333	40	84	10	0	0
Spouse with children	1,767	100	684	39	933	53	150	8	0	0
Unknown	117	100	54	46	42	36	15	13	6	5
Total	37,536	100	8,655	23	26,208	70	2,619	7	54	0
Yukon ²										
Children only	300	100	81	27	198	66	21	7	0	0
Spouse only	15	100	9	60	6	40	0	0	0	0
Spouse with children	6	100	0	0	3	50	3	50	0	0
Unknown	81	100	9	11	21	26	0	0	51	63
Total	402	100	99	25	228	57	24	6	51	13

1. In Nova Scotia, separate figures for provincial orders and agreements are not available. The combined figure is included in unknown. Furthermore, the authority of the support order is unavailable for cases that do not have an active regular payment obligation.

2. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Alberta and Yukon report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.

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

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

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

	Cases enrolled		Sex of payor and recipient		
	number		Male	Female	Unknown ¹
			payor female recipient	payor male recipient	
			percent		
Prince Edward Island²					
2004	2,466	100	95	0	5
2005	2,457	100	91	0	9
2006	2,571	100	87	0	13
2007	2,598	100	87	0	13
2008	2,538	100	86	2	11
Nova Scotia²					
2004
2005	18,177	100	96	3	1
2006	18,171	100	96	3	1
2007	17,568	100	96	3	1
2008	16,962	100	96	3	1
Saskatchewan					
2004	7,839	100	98	2	0
2005	7,791	100	98	2	0
2006	7,629	100	98	2	0
2007	7,551	100	98	2	0
2008	7,605	100	98	2	0
Alberta²					
2004
2005
2006	45,972	100	96	3	1
2007	44,619	100	96	3	1
2008	44,166	100	96	3	1
British Columbia					
2004	39,780	100	97	3	1
2005	38,811	100	97	3	1
2006	38,349	100	96	3	1
2007	37,566	100	96	3	1
2008	37,536	100	96	3	1
Yukon²					
2004	417	100	97	2	1
2005	438	100	97	3	1
2006	423	100	96	3	1
2007	399	100	97	2	1
2008	405	100	96	3	1
Northwest Territories²					
2004
2005	654	100	90	4	6
2006	630	100	91	3	6
2007	657	100	91	4	5
2008	687	100	92	4	4

1. The "unknown" category includes a small proportion of "other" cases, which consists of male payor and male recipient, or female payor and female recipient.

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

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

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

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

	Payor	Recipient	Children
	years (median age)		
Prince Edward Island ¹			
2004	41	39	14
2005	41	38	14
2006	42	40	15
2007	43	40	16
2008	43	41	16
Nova Scotia ¹			
2004
2005	41	39	14
2006	42	39	14
2007	42	39	15
2008	42	40	15
New Brunswick ¹			
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008	40	38	14
Saskatchewan ²			
2004	41	39	14
2005	41	39	14
2006	42	39	14
2007	42	39	14
2008	42	39	14
Alberta ¹			
2004
2005
2006	41	38	13
2007	41	38	13
2008	41	38	13
British Columbia			
2004	42	39	13
2005	42	40	13
2006	43	40	13
2007	43	40	13
2008	43	41	13
Yukon ¹			
2004	42	38	13
2005	43	38	13
2006	43	39	13
2007	43	39	13
2008	43	40	13
Northwest Territories ¹			
2004
2005	39	36	13
2006	40	37	14
2007	40	37	14
2008	41	38	14

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

2. Median age for children for Saskatchewan includes all children associated on the order, including an unknown number who may not be covered by the agreement.

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

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

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

	Cases enrolled		Cases assigned ¹	
	number		number	percent
Prince Edward Island ²				
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008	2,538		87	3
Nova Scotia ²				
2004
2005	18,189		2,415	13
2006	18,177		2,394	13
2007	17,577		2,370	13
2008	16,965		2,328	14
New Brunswick ²				
2004	13,536		3,225	24
2005	12,987		2,967	23
2006	12,807		2,913	23
2007	12,840		2,835	22
2008	12,687		2,817	22
Quebec				
2004	102,339		22,650	22
2005	104,385		21,441	21
2006	106,227		20,223	19
2007	107,070		19,164	18
2008	106,512		16,743	16
Ontario				
2004	176,730		17,625	10
2005	178,251		16,965	10
2006	175,005		16,356	9
2007	170,826		16,320	10
2008	175,062		16,725	10
Saskatchewan				
2004	7,848		378	5
2005	7,791		366	5
2006	7,635		315	4
2007	7,548		267	4
2008	7,614		267	4
Alberta ²				
2004
2005
2006	45,963		2,649	6
2007	44,619		2,370	5
2008	44,175		2,274	5
British Columbia ³				
2004	39,774		6,435	16
2005	38,814		5,601	14
2006	38,355		5,205	14
2007	37,572		4,806	13
2008	37,536		4,956	13

1. Assignment status indicates that the recipient is receiving social assistance and has assigned their entitlement to receive support payments to the government.

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

3. In British Columbia, all support payments received are disbursed to the recipients, regardless of the social assistance status of the recipient. However, recipients on social assistance may have their social assistance benefits reduced based on the amount of support received. For the purposes of this report, these cases are considered assigned.

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

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

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

	Cases enrolled		Regular monthly payment due							
			\$0 ¹	\$1 to \$200	\$201 to \$400	\$401 to \$600	\$601 to \$800	\$801 to \$1,000	\$1,001 to \$2,000	Over \$2,000
	number	percent								
Prince Edward Island ²										
2004	2,469	100	14	33	35	11	4	1	2	0
2005	2,463	100	14	33	35	11	4	1	2	0
2006	2,571	100	16	31	34	12	4	2	2	0
2007	2,601	100	19	29	32	12	4	2	2	0
2008	2,529	100	19	28	32	12	4	2	2	0
Nova Scotia ²										
2004
2005	18,183	100	10	43	27	11	4	2	2	1
2006	18,171	100	11	41	28	11	4	2	2	1
2007	17,565	100	12	38	28	12	5	2	2	1
2008	16,962	100	15	35	28	12	5	2	3	1
New Brunswick ²										
2004	13,542	100	17	41	27	8	3	1	1	0
2005	12,981	100	16	40	28	9	3	2	2	0
2006	12,816	100	15	40	29	10	3	1	2	1
2007	12,828	100	16	38	29	10	3	2	2	0
2008	12,702	100	14	39	30	10	3	1	2	1
Quebec										
2004	102,336	100	10	21	37	17	7	3	4	1
2005	104,388	100	10	21	37	17	7	3	4	1
2006	106,227	100	9	20	37	18	8	3	4	1
2007	107,070	100	8	20	37	18	8	3	4	1
2008	106,506	100	7	20	38	19	8	4	4	1
Ontario										
2004	176,727	100	21	24	26	14	6	3	4	1
2005	178,251	100	23	22	26	13	6	3	4	1
2006	175,005	100	23	22	27	14	6	3	4	1
2007	170,835	100	21	22	27	14	7	4	5	1
2008	175,053	100	23	21	26	14	7	4	5	1
Saskatchewan										
2004	7,836	100	13	32	32	14	6	2	2	0
2005	7,785	100	13	31	32	15	5	2	2	0
2006	7,635	100	13	29	32	15	6	3	2	0
2007	7,560	100	14	28	32	15	6	2	2	0
2008	7,611	100	15	26	32	15	6	2	3	1
Alberta ²										
2004
2005
2006	45,963	100	19	24	30	14	6	3	3	1
2007	44,622	100	20	22	30	15	6	3	3	1
2008	44,160	100	22	20	29	15	6	3	4	1
British Columbia										
2004	39,774	100	12	31	33	14	5	3	2	1
2005	38,808	100	13	29	33	14	5	3	3	1
2006	38,343	100	13	28	33	14	5	3	3	1
2007	37,569	100	14	27	33	14	6	3	3	1
2008	37,545	100	16	24	32	15	6	3	3	1
Yukon ²										
2004	423	100	11	23	34	19	5	4	3	1
2005	441	100	12	26	36	18	3	3	2	1
2006	414	100	12	22	38	18	4	2	3	0
2007	408	100	13	26	33	16	7	2	2	0
2008	399	100	13	25	36	16	7	3	1	0
Northwest Territories ²										
2004
2005	654	100	16	14	32	20	8	6	4	0
2006	636	100	14	11	32	24	9	5	5	0
2007	657	100	15	11	31	21	10	7	5	1
2008	687	100	17	10	29	22	10	7	5	0

1. Cases may have a \$0 amount due for several reasons including: they have no regular ongoing obligation, they only have arrears, or they have a different payment schedule, such as quarterly.

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

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

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

Table 10
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled and regular monthly median payment due, by type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2008

	Cases enrolled	Type of beneficiary								
		One child	Two children	Three children or more	Spouse only	Spouse with one child	Spouse with two children	Spouse with three children or more	Other	Unknown
number										
Prince Edward Island ¹	2,535	1,314	675	258	72	36	33	9	0	138
Nova Scotia ¹	16,965	9,567	4,302	1,308	843	273	294	150	6	222
New Brunswick ¹	12,693	7,248	3,213	846	504	108	117	51	0	606
Saskatchewan	7,617	3,783	1,848	855	204	126	144	84	0	573
Alberta ¹	44,166	20,904	8,526	2,382	1,101	300	372	183	0	10,398
British Columbia	37,536	23,028	8,703	3,090	831	753	711	303	0	117
Yukon ¹	402	222	54	24	15	6	0	0	0	81
Northwest Territories ^{1, 2}	690	378	183	111	18	.	.	.	0	0
Median regular payment due										
	Cases enrolled	One child	Two children	Three children or more	Spouse only	Spouse with one child	Spouse with two children	Spouse with three children or more	Other	Unknown
dollars										
Prince Edward Island ¹	211	196	275	362	450	269	500	469	...	200
Nova Scotia ¹	201	159	300	369	362	378	657	717	190	200
New Brunswick ¹	200	161	286	359	500	490	905	1,590
Saskatchewan	255	223	341	455	400	350	668	815
Alberta ¹	259	268	480	600	585	1,089	1,500	1,896
British Columbia	266	221	375	405	500	500	754	868
Yukon ¹	300	287	488	658	200	1,098
Northwest Territories ^{1, 2}	369	307	400	658	480

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

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

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

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

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

	Cases administered with a regular amount due ¹	Regular amount due	Regular amount received	
	number	millions of dollars		percent
Prince Edward Island²				
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008	2,313	8.6	5.2	61
Nova Scotia^{2, 3}				
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006	18,879	62.9	39.3	62
2006/2007	18,582	63.3	39.7	63
2007/2008	17,649	63.3	40.6	64
Quebec⁴				
2003/2004
2004/2005	100,359	453.5	407.6	90
2005/2006	102,915	470.7	421.5	90
2006/2007	104,496	484.7	434.2	90
2007/2008	105,375	493.7	444.3	90
Saskatchewan				
2003/2004	7,995	30.2	23.5	78
2004/2005	7,953	32.3	24.7	77
2005/2006	7,863	31.6	25.4	80
2006/2007	7,794	32.2	27.1	84
2007/2008	7,779	33.6	28.8	86
Alberta²				
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006	44,349	186.0	118.6	64
2006/2007	42,309	184.0	122.5	67
2007/2008	40,746	187.7	127.6	68
British Columbia³				
2003/2004	40,098	151.6	108.1	71
2004/2005	38,706	149.8	109.2	73
2005/2006	37,809	148.9	109.1	73
2006/2007	36,675	149.4	110.1	74
2007/2008	35,928	151.8	113.1	75
Yukon^{2, 3}				
2003/2004	444	1.8	1.1	63
2004/2005	450	1.7	1.2	68
2005/2006	450	1.7	1.2	70
2006/2007	429	1.7	1.1	68
2007/2008	417	1.7	1.2	69
Northwest Territories²				
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006	645	3.1	1.9	61
2006/2007	669	3.2	1.9	60
2007/2008	678	3.4	1.9	57

1. Excludes those cases that only have other types of payments due (scheduled arrears, event-driven payments, and fees, costs and penalties).
 2. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
 3. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon maintain a policy of allowing direct payments to be made and received by their clientele throughout the case duration, and since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.
 4. In certain cases if the program is certain to recover the sum from the payor, Quebec legislation allows for the Maintenance Enforcement Program to provide an advance to the recipient to help ensure regularity of payments. Advances are considered to be support payments and must be repaid by the payor.
- Note(s):** Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. Cases administered include cases registered for at least part of the year, i.e. cases enrolled and cases terminated. The amount due represents the total regular amount due for the year.
- Source(s):** Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 12
Maintenance enforcement cases administered, by total amount due and received, 2007/2008

	Cases administered ¹	Total amount due ²	Total amount received ^{3,4}	
	number	millions of dollars		percent
Prince Edward Island				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	2,505	7.9	5.7	73
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	265	0.7	0.4	52
Total	2,770	8.6	6.1	71
Nova Scotia				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	18,510	61.0	48.4	79
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	1,385	3.9	2.9	74
Total	19,895	64.9	51.3	79
Alberta				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	41,135	184.1	151.9	83
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	9,575	35.0	28.5	81
Total	50,710	219.2	180.5	82
Yukon				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	275	1.1	1.1	100+
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	200	0.6	0.6	97
Total	475	1.7	1.7	100
Northwest Territories				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	515	2.6	2.2	85
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	275	1.0	1.0	100+
Total	790	3.5	3.1	90

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

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. Total may not add up due to rounding.

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

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

	Cases in compliance	Regular monthly payment due						Over \$2,000
		\$1 to \$200	\$201 to \$400	\$401 to \$600	\$601 to \$800	\$801 to \$1,000	\$1,001 to \$2,000	
percent								
Prince Edward Island ¹								
2004	55	43	50	55	58	50	36	50
2005	55	44	49	53	61	55	47	50
2006	58	44	51	57	61	50	47	...
2007	58	42	51	56	67	41	48	33
2008	59	45	48	52	66	69	50	50
Nova Scotia ^{1, 2}								
2004
2005	55	45	54	55	58	55	49	53
2006	56	44	54	57	58	53	53	51
2007	56	44	54	57	58	53	58	51
2008	57	44	53	56	56	54	56	50
New Brunswick ¹								
2004	61	48	56	62	60	61	66	44
2005	60	49	55	56	54	57	47	40
2006	62	52	58	59	62	58	55	27
2007	65	54	63	64	65	60	64	61
2008	62	53	58	58	60	57	56	54
Quebec ³								
2004	79	68	74	82	85	87	86	84
2005	78	67	73	81	84	86	85	85
2006	78	68	74	81	84	87	86	83
2007	77	68	72	80	84	85	86	84
2008	77	69	72	80	84	86	86	86
Ontario ⁴								
2004	63	42	54	60	62	65	61	51
2005	64	43	54	59	62	63	60	51
2006	66	47	56	62	64	66	63	54
2007	64	45	54	60	63	65	62	53
2008	62	42	50	56	59	62	60	51
Saskatchewan								
2004	67	59	64	67	62	62	68	83
2005	68	60	65	64	61	67	61	50
2006	69	60	67	67	62	64	64	56
2007	69	59	66	66	63	66	62	60
2008	66	55	62	64	58	71	59	43
Alberta ¹								
2004
2005
2006	70	59	66	61	63	66	62	59
2007	64	49	55	59	59	61	61	58
2008	65	49	55	58	60	59	60	55
British Columbia ²								
2004	63	53	60	62	60	58	55	55
2005	65	55	61	63	61	60	56	56
2006	65	55	61	62	61	61	55	55
2007	64	54	60	62	60	61	57	53
2008	65	57	60	60	59	57	60	54
Yukon ^{1, 2}								
2004	62	50	54	67	43	83	50	100
2005	65	53	62	62	50	50	100	100
2006	60	48	55	60	50	67	75	...
2007	62	49	49	68	70	100	67	...
2008	63	58	52	71	56	50	100	...
Northwest Territories ¹								
2004
2005	57	39	53	45	50	42	75	...
2006	61	54	54	56	47	40	73	...
2007	56	36	48	50	52	60	55	50
2008	55	48	42	48	52	31	50	100

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

2. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon maintain a policy of allowing direct payments to be made and received by their clientele throughout the case duration, and since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.

3. In certain cases, if the program is certain to recover the sum from the payor, Quebec legislation allows for the Maintenance Enforcement Program to provide an advance to the recipient to help ensure regularity of payments. Advances are considered to be support payments and must be repaid by the payor.

4. Ontario may have some cases that paid beyond month end that are included as having made a payment in the month.

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. Regular payments are the ongoing amount ordered or agreed to. Compliance in this instance indicates that the regular amount expected in the month was received. The figure for compliance on total cases includes cases where no monthly payment is due. As cases with no payment in a month are coded as 100% compliant, the compliance for total cases may be higher than it would be if based solely on the numbers for the different payment categories shown in this table.

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

Table 14
Maintenance enforcement cases in compliance with regular payments due, by type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2008

	Type of beneficiary								
	Children only			Spouse only			Spouse with children		
	Cases enrolled	Cases in compliance		Cases enrolled	Cases in compliance		Cases enrolled	Cases in compliance	
	number	percent	number	percent		number	percent		
Prince Edward Island ¹	2,247	1,311	58	66	51	77	78	48	62
Nova Scotia ^{1, 2}	15,183	8,445	56	843	612	73	714	435	61
New Brunswick ¹	11,307	6,870	61	510	342	67	276	177	64
Saskatchewan	6,495	4,089	63	201	153	76	348	231	66
Alberta ¹	31,809	17,532	55	1,098	702	64	852	378	44
British Columbia ²	34,818	22,827	66	837	603	72	1,776	1,038	58
Yukon ^{1, 2}	300	174	58	15	9	60	3	3	100
Northwest Territories ^{1, 3}	669	366	55	18	9	50	.	.	.

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

2. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon maintain a policy of allowing direct payments to be made and received by their clientele throughout the case duration, and since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.

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

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

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

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

	Cases in compliance												Average ¹
	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	
	percent												
Prince Edward Island²													
2003/2004	55	52	52	52	50	52	51	52	51	53	51	55	52
2004/2005	50	54	51	52	56	53	55	55	53	54	55	55	54
2005/2006	54	56	53	53	54	53	53	52	53	54	55	58	54
2006/2007	56	56	56	54	56	56	56	55	56	58	55	58	56
2007/2008	59	57	59	57	57	57	58	58	56	57	58	59	58
Nova Scotia^{2, 3}													
2003/2004
2004/2005	53	53	54	53	51	53	55	..
2005/2006	54	56	55	53	54	53	53	55	52	54	53	56	54
2006/2007	54	56	55	54	55	52	56	56	53	56	54	56	55
2007/2008	55	58	57	56	56	56	59	57	54	58	57	57	57
New Brunswick⁴													
2003/2004	48	59	55	59	54	..	58	55	56	59	54	61	56
2004/2005	59	61	57	58	60	57	55	57	57	59	52	60	58
2005/2006	58	63	58	59	61	59	60	56	58	62	59	62	60
2006/2007	61	61	60	61	59	57	62	57	62	62	56	65	60
2007/2008	63	64	61	62	..
Quebec⁵													
2003/2004	79	79	80	79	80	79	79	79	79	76	78	79	79
2004/2005	79	79	81	81	81	80	79	79	79	75	78	78	79
2005/2006	78	79	80	80	80	80	78	80	79	75	77	78	79
2006/2007	78	79	81	79	80	79	79	80	79	76	78	77	79
2007/2008	77	80	80	79	80	78	79	80	79	76	78	77	79
Ontario⁶													
2003/2004	60	62	62	61	59	62	62	59	60	61	..	63	61
2004/2005	63	63	64	64	63	63	63	63	63	62	64	64	63
2005/2006	65	65	66	64	65	65	65	66	65	65	64	66	65
2006/2007	64	65	65	62	62	63	63	62	61	63	61	64	63
2007/2008	63	64	63	63	64	62	64	63	61	62	..	62	63
Saskatchewan													
2003/2004	67	65	64	66	60	63	65	61	65	60	61	67	64
2004/2005	67	66	66	64	65	65	65	67	65	64	63	68	65
2005/2006	68	67	68	61	67	66	66	67	66	63	65	69	66
2006/2007	66	69	66	65	67	66	68	66	68	66	65	69	67
2007/2008	69	70	67	66	68	64	69	67	66	67	65	66	67
Alberta²													
2003/2004
2004/2005
2005/2006	58	59	59	57	58	58	58	61	59	61	61	70	60
2006/2007	61	63	62	61	63	61	63	62	60	63	62	64	62
2007/2008	64	65	63	64	64	62	66	64	62	65	64	65	64
British Columbia³													
2003/2004	61	61	60	60	59	61	62	59	61	58	58	63	60
2004/2005	62	61	62	61	62	61	61	64	64	63	63	65	62
2005/2006	65	63	64	62	63	63	63	63	62	63	63	65	63
2006/2007	64	65	64	63	64	63	65	64	62	64	63	64	64
2007/2008	65	65	64	65	65	63	66	65	63	65	65	65	65
Yukon^{2, 3}													
2003/2004	59	59	58	59	55	58	59	54	59	54	55	62	58
2004/2005	60	61	60	62	60	60	57	61	58	56	59	65	60
2005/2006	62	64	64	56	63	60	59	59	61	56	57	60	60
2006/2007	54	63	61	58	63	57	59	58	54	59	55	62	59
2007/2008	59	62	56	60	62	57	61	56	55	62	54	63	59
Northwest Territories²													
2003/2004
2004/2005	57	..
2005/2006	56	60	47	51	56	57	52	56	49	57	54	61	55
2006/2007	51	66	55	47	55	53	51	58	45	57	48	56	54
2007/2008	47	61	54	56	54	51	57	55	43	57	45	55	53

1. The average monthly compliance rate for the year is calculated by taking the sum of the monthly figures and dividing by 12. In certain instances, monthly average caseload is calculated using 11 months of data if caseload data from one month are not available.

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

3. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon maintain a policy of allowing direct payments to be made and received by their clientele throughout the case duration, and since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.

4. New Brunswick converted to a new information system in February 2008 and a new interface to the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs was built for the new system. Data collected the first few months of 2007/2008 was through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey. Data for March 2008 was collected through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

5. In certain cases if the program is certain to recover the sum from the payor, Quebec legislation allows for the Maintenance Enforcement Program to provide an advance to the recipient to help ensure regularity of payments. Advances are considered to be support payments and must be repaid by the payor.

6. Ontario may have some cases that paid beyond month end that are included as having made a payment for the month.

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. Regular payments are the ongoing amount ordered or agreed to. Compliance indicates that the regular amount expected in a month was received in full by the end of the month.

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

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

	Cases enrolled with a regular payment due ¹		Regularity of monthly compliance				
			In full compliance every month	In full compliance between 6 to 11 months	In full compliance between 1 to 5 months	Never in full compliance, some money received	Never in full compliance, no money received
	number	percent					
Prince Edward Island							
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008	1,815	100	26	29	15	4	26
Nova Scotia ^{2, 3}							
2005/2006	14,290	100	27	30	16	3	24
2006/2007	13,690	100	30	29	16	3	22
2007/2008	12,975	100	31	30	16	4	20
Alberta							
2005/2006	32,415	100	31	29	21	4	15
2006/2007	30,935	100	35	28	18	5	15
2007/2008	29,485	100	37	27	16	5	15
Yukon ²							
2005/2006	305	100	27	43	17	2	11
2006/2007	290	100	29	39	18	4	11
2007/2008	275	100	31	40	16	5	7
Northwest Territories							
2005/2006	450	100	13	45	33	4	6
2006/2007	435	100	13	44	33	2	7
2007/2008	455	100	11	46	31	5	7

1. Cases enrolled includes all cases enrolled for the entire fiscal year that had a regular payment due each month.

2. Nova Scotia and Yukon maintain a policy of allowing direct payments to be made and received by their clientele throughout the case duration, and since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have. In both jurisdictions, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.

3. In Nova Scotia, cases in compliance were slightly underestimated in November and December 2005, which may impact the results for 2005/2006.

Note(s): Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded.

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

Table 17
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by arrears history and status, at March 31, 2008

	Cases enrolled	Status at entry						Unknown
		No arrears at entry		Entered with arrears				
		No current arrears	Arrears have increased	Arrears have been paid off	Arrears have decreased	Arrears remained constant	Arrears have increased	
		number						
Prince Edward Island ^{1, 2}	2,538	282	393	402	237	27	705	492
Nova Scotia ²	16,962	3,489	4,074	2,790	2,160	219	4,155	75
Quebec ³	131,748	38,862	6,990	44,331	17,655	435	20,862	2,613
Saskatchewan	7,608	1,368	1,275	1,524	1,320	54	2,067	0
Alberta ²	44,169	8,655	13,929	6,354	4,842	111	10,278	0
British Columbia	37,533	5,481	4,359	7,611	5,487	468	14,127	0
		percent						
Prince Edward Island ^{1, 2}	100	11	15	16	9	1	28	19
Nova Scotia ²	100	21	24	16	13	1	24	0
Quebec ³	100	29	5	34	13	0	16	2
Saskatchewan	100	18	17	20	17	1	27	0
Alberta ²	100	20	32	14	11	0	23	0
British Columbia	100	15	12	20	15	1	38	0

1. Prince Edward Island has a high number of unknowns because of a change in its information system.
2. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Alberta report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
3. On November 1, 1996, the Ministère du Revenu implemented the information system of the maintenance enforcement program. When that happened, Quebec knew the amount of arrears due at the time, but could not establish the arrears status at entry for the cases registered before that date. These "unknown" cases account for approximately 2% of Quebec's caseload.

Note(s): Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. At entry into a maintenance enforcement program, arrears status may be unknown until an accurate balance is produced. Therefore, some payors can actually be in arrears but be recorded as having no arrears.

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

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

	Cases enrolled		Cases with arrears		Arrears due
	number		percent	millions of dollars	
Prince Edward Island ¹					
2004	2,469	1,755	71	12.5	
2005	2,463	1,716	70	11.6	
2006	2,571	1,767	69	13.4	
2007	2,598	1,785	69	13.9	
2008	2,538	1,707	67	15.1	
Nova Scotia ^{1, 2}					
2004
2005	18,183	12,009	66	82.3	
2006	18,171	11,661	64	85.1	
2007	17,577	11,148	63	82.2	
2008	16,965	10,608	63	80.2	
New Brunswick ¹					
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008	12,690	8,115	64	39.9	
Quebec					
2004	102,336	48,723	48	283.7	
2005	104,388	45,387	43	285.3	
2006	106,227	47,682	45	297.2	
2007	107,070	47,280	44	307.5	
2008	106,512	46,017	43	285.1	
Ontario					
2004	176,727	132,654	75	1,192.0	
2005	178,251	136,623	77	1,198.8	
2006	175,005	126,486	72	1,190.6	
2007	170,826	130,956	77	1,233.3	
2008	175,062	134,031	77	1,299.8	
Saskatchewan					
2004	7,836	4,674	60	34.4	
2005	7,785	4,674	60	37.3	
2006	7,635	4,512	59	38.5	
2007	7,548	4,587	61	39.8	
2008	7,614	4,722	62	42.3	
Alberta ¹					
2004
2005
2006	45,963	32,016	70	387.3	
2007	44,619	29,778	67	384.3	
2008	44,175	29,163	66	395.7	
British Columbia ^{2, 3}					
2004	39,774	26,421	66	269.9	
2005	38,808	25,410	65	277.5	
2006	38,343	25,077	65	284.4	
2007	37,572	24,609	65	288.3	
2008	37,536	24,438	65	300.8	
Yukon ^{1, 2}					
2004	423	288	68	3.9	
2005	441	282	64	4.0	
2006	414	258	62	3.6	
2007	402	246	61	3.4	
2008	414	222	54	3.4	
Northwest Territories ¹					
2004
2005	654	522	80	6.5	
2006	636	495	78	6.6	
2007	654	522	80	6.9	
2008	684	522	76	7.4	

1. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
2. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon maintain a policy of allowing direct payments to be made and received by their clientele throughout the case duration, and since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.
3. In British Columbia, dollars due and received for interest have not been included.

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

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

Table 19
Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by percentage received of regular monthly payment due, at March 31

	Cases with arrears		Proportion of regular monthly payment due received in March					
	number		0	1 to 25	26 to 50	51 to 75	76 to 99	100
			percent					
Prince Edward Island ¹								
2004	1,758	100	47	1	4	3	4	41
2005	1,722	100	47	1	4	2	6	40
2006	1,770	100	47	1	3	3	4	42
2007	1,785	100	47	1	2	3	4	43
2008	1,707	100	47	1	2	3	4	44
Nova Scotia ^{1, 2}								
2004
2005	11,997	100	57	0	2	2	3	36
2006	11,670	100	56	1	2	3	3	36
2007	11,148	100	56	0	2	3	3	36
2008	10,605	100	54	1	2	2	3	38
New Brunswick ¹								
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008	8,109	100	40	2	3	4	3	49
Quebec								
2004	48,726	100	30	1	5	3	6	55
2005	45,396	100	35	2	6	3	7	48
2006	47,676	100	33	2	6	2	6	50
2007	47,274	100	36	1	6	2	6	48
2008	46,023	100	36	1	6	3	6	47
Ontario								
2004	132,651	100	40	1	1	2	5	51
2005	136,623	100	37	1	2	2	5	53
2006	126,483	100	37	1	2	2	4	53
2007	130,953	100	38	1	2	2	4	53
2008	134,034	100	39	2	2	3	4	51
Saskatchewan								
2004	4,668	100	44	1	2	2	2	49
2005	4,677	100	43	1	2	3	2	50
2006	4,512	100	41	1	2	3	2	51
2007	4,575	100	40	1	2	2	3	53
2008	4,713	100	42	1	2	3	2	50
Alberta ¹								
2004
2005
2006	32,022	100	34	1	2	2	2	60
2007	29,775	100	44	1	2	2	1	51
2008	29,160	100	42	1	1	2	2	52
British Columbia ²								
2004	26,424	100	45	2	3	3	4	44
2005	25,413	100	42	2	3	3	4	46
2006	25,077	100	42	2	3	3	4	46
2007	24,606	100	43	2	3	3	4	46
2008	24,444	100	38	3	5	3	4	47
Yukon ¹								
2004	282	100	43	1	2	4	2	48
2005	279	100	44	1	2	2	1	49
2006	252	100	49	0	2	2	2	44
2007	243	100	49	0	2	2	1	44
2008	219	100	42	4	5	4	3	41
Northwest Territories ¹								
2004
2005	522	100	44	0	2	2	2	49
2006	498	100	37	2	3	4	2	52
2007	522	100	45	1	2	2	2	48
2008	519	100	38	5	6	3	1	46

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

2. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon maintain a policy of allowing direct payments to be made and received by their clientele throughout the case duration, and since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.

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

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

Table 20
Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by elapsed time since last payment, at March 31

	Cases with arrears		New cases in default	Time since payment received			No payments ever made		Unknown ¹	
	number	percent		Less than or equal to 1 month	Greater than 1 to 3 months	Greater than 3 to 12 months	Greater than 12 months	Cases less than and equal to 12 months old		Cases greater than 12 months old
Prince Edward Island²										
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008	1,707	100	0	42	7	10	1	2	0	37
Nova Scotia^{2, 3}										
2004
2005	12,009	100	0	34	11	7	0	3	5	39
2006	11,661	100	1	34	11	12	4	4	5	29
2007	11,148	100	1	33	12	13	9	4	6	21
2008	10,608	100	0	34	14	13	13	4	6	15
Quebec										
2004	48,723	100	1	52	17	12	11	2	5	0
2005	45,387	100	1	46	20	14	12	2	5	0
2006	47,682	100	1	49	19	14	12	2	4	0
2007	47,280	100	1	47	21	14	12	1	3	0
2008	46,017	100	1	56	16	13	11	2	2	0
Saskatchewan										
2004	4,674	100	0	46	17	16	14	4	3	0
2005	4,674	100	0	47	18	14	13	4	3	0
2006	4,512	100	0	48	16	15	14	3	4	0
2007	4,587	100	0	50	18	13	13	4	3	0
2008	4,722	100	0	45	19	14	13	5	2	0
Alberta²										
2004
2005
2006	32,016	100	1	55	7	10	0	3	6	19
2007	29,778	100	1	38	14	17	8	4	6	13
2008	29,163	100	1	39	14	15	13	3	6	10
British Columbia³										
2004	26,421	100	1	39	20	16	16	4	4	0
2005	25,410	100	1	41	19	15	16	4	4	0
2006	25,077	100	1	41	19	16	16	4	4	0
2007	24,609	100	1	40	19	15	17	3	4	0
2008	24,438	100	1	47	13	15	17	4	4	0
Yukon^{2, 3}										
2004	288	100	0	48	14	17	0	5	0	17
2005	282	100	3	45	18	13	6	1	3	11
2006	258	100	1	37	17	20	10	5	2	7
2007	246	100	2	38	18	17	10	5	4	6
2008	222	100	1	47	12	18	9	4	4	4
Northwest Territories²										
2004
2005
2006	495	100	2	53	16	16	1	3	0	8
2007	522	100	1	47	20	18	3	5	2	4
2008	522	100	1	52	13	20	5	5	2	3

1. The Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs does not collect historical data on cases before the commencement of Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs data collection. Cases existing when Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs collection started are classified as unknown, if there is no record of payment being received for these cases in the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

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

3. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon maintain a policy of allowing direct payments to be made and received by their clientele throughout the case duration, and since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.

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

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

Table 21
Number and type of enforcement actions for maintenance enforcement cases administered, 2007/2008

	Enforcement actions						
	Prince Edward Island ¹	Nova Scotia ¹	Saskatchewan	Alberta ¹	British Columbia	Yukon ¹	Northwest Territories ¹
	number						
Administrative enforcement action							
Demand for payment	69	3,087	51	...	28,125
Demand for information	..	639	4,185	20,709	327	579	0
Maintenance enforcement program trace	..	357	3,210	31,632	51,807	87	..
Jurisdictional garnishment and attachment	366	1,986	2,193	53,871	35,517	201	330
Voluntary payment arrangement	6	51	0	7,605	3,033	3	..
Credit Bureau reporting	0	...	0	1,656	6,774	45	0
Land registration	0	0	549	336	3,144	3	0
Personal property lien	0	5,871	2,970	3	..
Motor vehicle licence intervention	39	168	411	20,616	3,141	27	..
Writ of execution	6	..	21	3	0	0	72
Collection calls	0	..	0
Examination of payor	138	99	0	..	0
Other administrative enforcement actions	3,306	36	0	72	14,136	171	18
Subtotal	3,930	6,423	10,620	142,371	148,974	1,119	420
Administrative action under federal legislation							
Federal trace (FOAEAA ³ -Part I)	9	..	0	10,119	0	21	..
Interception of federal funds (FOAEAA ³ -Part II)	375	1,917	1,386	10,842	7,965	108	87
Federal licence suspension (FOAEAA ³ -Part III)	3	..	0	7,431	2,664	33	18
Federal garnishment (GAPDA ⁴)	9	33	3	72	39	0	..
Subtotal	396	1,950	1,389	28,464	10,668	162	105
Total administrative actions	4,326	8,373	12,009	170,835	159,642	1,281	525
Court enforcement							
Default hearing	342	..	108	..	486	0	0
Committal hearing	0	..	159	..	0
Other court enforcement activities ²	36	..	0	..	1,809	0	3
Total court enforcement actions	378	..	108	..	2,454	0	3
	percent						
Administrative enforcement action							
Demand for payment	2	28	0	...	18
Demand for information	..	9	35	12	0	45	0
Maintenance enforcement plan trace	..	3	27	19	32	7	..
Jurisdictional garnishment and attachment	8	25	18	32	22	16	63
Voluntary payment arrangement	0	1	0	4	2	0	..
Credit Bureau reporting	0	...	0	1	4	4	0
Land registration	0	0	5	0	2	0	0
Personal property lien	0	3	2	0	..
Motor vehicle licence intervention	1	3	3	12	2	2	..
Writ of execution	0	..	0	0	0	0	14
Collection calls	0	..	0
Examination of payor	3	2	0	..	0
Other administrative enforcement actions	76	0	0	0	9	13	3
Subtotal	91	72	88	83	93	87	80
Administrative action under federal legislation							
Federal trace (FOAEAA ³ -Part I)	0	..	0	6	0	2	..
Interception of federal funds (FOAEAA ³ -Part II)	9	28	12	6	5	8	17
Federal licence suspension (FOAEAA ³ -Part III)	0	..	0	4	2	3	3
Federal garnishment (GAPDA ⁴)	0	1	0	0	0	0	..
Subtotal	9	28	12	17	7	13	20
Total administrative actions	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Court enforcement							
Default hearing	90	..	100	..	21	0	0
Committal hearing	0	..	0
Other court enforcement activities ²	10	..	0	..	79	0	100
Total court enforcement actions	100	..	100	..	100	0	100

1. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
2. Other kinds of court enforcement activity include execution orders, registering an order against personal property, appointing a receiver, order to provide information, issuing a warrant for arrest, appointing a trustee in bankruptcy, and issuing writs for seizure and sale.
3. *Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act.*
4. *Garnishment, Attachment, and Pension Diversion Act.*

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

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

Methodology

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

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

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

The SMEP is currently being implemented by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) at Statistics Canada. It is a microdata survey that will eventually collect data from all 13 provincial/territorial MEPs. Once all jurisdictions currently reporting to the MES are converted to SMEP, the MES will be terminated. The switch from aggregate to microdata collection allows for more extensive and dynamic analysis of maintenance enforcement information. The SMEP can produce all statistics presently available through the MES, as well as numerous additional types of analyses and views of maintenance enforcement data.

Data collection

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

Survey coverage

The current report presents data for fiscal years 2003/2004 through 2007/2008. For 2007/2008, there are 10 reporting jurisdictions: Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, which report to the MES survey, and Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories which provide data to the SMEP survey. Together, these 10 jurisdictions account for about 95% of Canada's population.

Because the survey was implemented in different jurisdictions at different points in time, data coverage over the five-year period varies by jurisdiction. Additionally, some publication tables do not include all 10 survey respondents because the data are not available from some jurisdictions.

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

Reported timeframes

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

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

Data limitations

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

Prince Edward Island

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

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

Nova Scotia

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

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

New Brunswick

In 2007/2008, New Brunswick migrated to a new information system. During this time, data was not collected from New Brunswick for a number of months. As part of the development project for the new system, a new data collection interface to the SMEP was built. On February 11, 2008, New Brunswick converted to the new system, and SMEP data collection began March 2008.

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

Quebec

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

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

Saskatchewan

Saskatchewan's information system is unable to provide an accurate median age of children for whom there are support payments. Instead, the ages of all children a couple has are included in the median age calculation, regardless of whether they are covered by the support agreement.

British Columbia

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

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

As described in **A description of maintenance enforcement services section**, British Columbia introduced a default fee in 1998/1999. Each year the payor is charged the equivalent of one month's maintenance, to a maximum of \$400, upon the second default of the year. This penalty, which is payable to the MEP, has resulted in an increase in caseload by about 7,000 cases, but information on these cases is not collected by the MES.

Northwest Territories

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

Yukon

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

To summarize, the national survey definitions do enable some comparisons between jurisdictions but always within the context of operational differences of the MEPs, differences in case profiles and differences in how data are reported to the survey. Nevertheless, with an increasing number of MEPs supplying data, a more complete picture

of the national context is emerging and ongoing data collection is beginning to provide an opportunity to examine trends over time.

Confidentiality/random rounding

Maintenance Enforcement Survey data have been subjected to a confidentiality procedure known as “random rounding” to reduce the likelihood of associating the data with any identifiable individual. The technique of random rounding provides protection against disclosure, but does not add significant distortion to the data. In this report, all MES and SMEP data involving counts of individuals or cases are randomly rounded either up or down to the nearest multiple of 3. Thus, a case count of 32 would become either 30 or 33 when rounded. Data in Table 15 from the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs also employed the random rounding procedure, except counts were rounded to the nearest multiple of 5.

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

Appendix I

Glossary of terms

Administrative survey

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

Aggregate survey

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

Appointment of receiver

This refers to action taken by a master/court administrator or a judge where a receiver is appointed to examine the payor's financial situation.

Arrears

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

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

Assignment status

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

Authority for the order

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

Beneficiary

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

Cases administered

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

Cases enrolled

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

Collection calls

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

Collection rate

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

Committal hearing

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

Compliance/default

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

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

Credit Bureau reporting

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

Default hearing

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

Demand for information

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

Demand for payment

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

Direct payments

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

Enforcement activity

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

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

Event-driven payments

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

Examination of payor

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

Execution order

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

Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act (FOAEAA)

Under the three parts of the federal *Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act (FOAEAA)*, MEPs can access different services provided by the Family Law Assistance Service (FLAS) of the federal Department of Justice. Part I allows for requests to search various federal databanks to determine the location of the payor. Part II

allows for the interception of federal money owing to a payor. This most frequently takes the form of intercepting an income tax refund. Part III allows the MEP to apply through FLAS to the applicable federal department to have federally-administered licenses revoked or denied. This encompasses passports and certain transport (aviation and marine) licenses.

Federal garnishment

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

Federal licence suspension

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

Federal trace

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

Garnishment, Attachment, and Pension Diversion Act (GAPDA)

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

Garnishment and attachment

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

Inherited arrears

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

Interception of federal funds

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

ISO status

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

- Non-ISO cases** These are typically cases where both parties live within the jurisdiction where the case is registered. Additionally, where parties conduct business, bank, or have assets in a jurisdiction, they may be registered there without residing there.
- ISO-in cases** These are cases that the jurisdiction has been asked to enforce by another jurisdiction because the payor is known to reside and/or have assets in its jurisdiction.
- ISO-out cases** These are cases that have been sent to another jurisdiction, and are registered there for enforcement purposes because the payor lives and/or has assets there.

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

Jurisdiction

This describes the province or territory.

Jurisdictional garnishment

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

Land registration

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

Maintenance enforcement plan trace

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

Microdata survey

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

Motor vehicle license intervention

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

Opt-in registration

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

Opt-out registration

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

Order forfeiture of security

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

Order to provide information

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

Pay-through system

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

Pay-to system

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

Payor

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

Personal property lien

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

Provincial agreement

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

Provincial order

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

Reason for termination

Cases will terminate or cease to be enrolled in a MEP for a variety of reasons. For example, orders expire as children age, the payor or recipient may die, or the recipient or payor may choose to withdraw from the program. In some

instances the program may close the case depending upon its policy. For example, a MEP might close a case if the recipient cannot be located or if the recipient is accepting direct payments contrary to the program's policy.

Recipient

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

Register order against personal property

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

Regular payments

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

Total payments

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

Voluntary payment arrangement

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

Writ of execution

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

Writ of seizure and sale

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