

SHARING THE CARING

- Ontario Federation of Labour  
Discussion Paper on Day Care

Prepared for

OFL Conference on Day Care

October 16-18, 1980

Toronto

NOTE: This paper has been approved,  
for discussion purposes only, by the  
OFL Women's Committee. It is not OFL  
policy.

Our children cannot afford this government excuse for inaction. Society is changing, new patterns are emerging. The social and demographic changes in the last few decades have been massive. The disruption of urbanization and industrialization, the diminution of extended family links, the proliferation of time-saving appliances and fast-foods, the women's movement, and perhaps, most importantly, the gradual realization growing out of extensive research and experience, that stimulating, developmental, quality daycare is extremely beneficial to young children - all these have contributed to new patterns of work and family life. Trade unions are recognizing that all adults, regardless of gender, are increasingly likely to be in the labour force, regardless of the economic fluctuations in society. People need and want to work. Society needs their labour and their children if it is to survive. Given this situation, new approaches must be taken which consider and respond to family needs.

### History

Day care centres were first opened in Canada in the 1850's in response to changing social conditions, the disruption of urbanization and industrialization, and the need for women to work outside the home. Their primary purpose was to provide relief for the poorest of the poor, with the additional liberal concern of preventing crime and vice by concentrating on the children of the poor.

The early providers of care were church groups and volunteer women's groups - primarily middle and upper class women doing charity work. An added benefit to the women who ran the centres was the ability to hire the mothers as domestics. Thus the daycare centre also served as an employment agency.

The care of our children is an issue which deeply affects all of us. It is not always an issue that is hotly debated or widely promoted. But it is there, fundamental, often worrying, in our home lives, in our work lives. And because we value our children so highly, we value the care which they receive. The real crux of this problem in fact, is the need to bring this whole issue out of the closet, to begin, as men and women, as trade unionists, to plan strategies collectively around our children's care, rather than coping as individuals, with individual, frustrating problems in attaining good care, and adjusting hours and schedules.

Unfortunately, the demands of the work place and policies of governments have never seriously taken into consideration the needs of families. It was assumed, in a class society, that women would rear the children.

There were two exceptions to this rule. The poor unfortunates, the working class women, who had to work and could not raise their own kids. These women were pitied and stigmatized and it was assumed their children would become delinquents and criminals.

On the other hand, the aristocracy, who never raised their own children, were envied their free time and the good care afforded their children by nannies and boarding schools.

Working people today, both women and men, are still plagued by the long-lasting results of these class assumptions. We are victims of the government dictum that your children are yours, you take care of them. And how well you take care of them still largely depends on how much money you have.

ability to hire the mothers as domestics. Thus the daycare centre

also served as an employment agency.

There was a vast social and economic gap between the providers and users of day care. The providers had no concept of day care as a social right that should be available to large numbers of people -- they saw it only as a form of welfare for desperate families, believing all the while that the best care for the child was in the home with mother. There was no suggestion that daycare could be a more enriching experience for children.

Daycare was a severely limited service until World War II, when government was forced to develop the service because of the need for women's employment in the war effort. However the daycare spaces initiated at this time were never universally available, but only to children whose mothers worked in government designated "essential industries". By the end of the war, in Canada 28 nurseries for pre-schoolers and 42 centres for school-age children had been established, and the service was highly accepted by both providers and users. When the war ended, despite considerable opposition, federal government support for daycare ended. In Ontario, however, where most of the centres existed and where the service was more entrenched, the battle continued, and still does to this day. The Day Nurseries Act was passed in 1946, which established good standards. But adequate funding was not forthcoming and many centres closed. The next years tell a story of minor successes and major defeats, as several active, political coalitions lobbied, and campaigned for more and better daycare. The ever-increasing need for daycare as more married women entered the workforce seemed only to discourage public support. Instead private enterprise in the form of commercial centres, filled the gap.

Pat Schulz, a well-known fighter for daycare in Toronto, and an expert in this area has said:

Day care was promoted as a means of acquiring female workers (first as domestic servants and later in the munitions industries), and as a method of ensuring the correct socialization of urban children...it is fair to say that there has been considerable continuity of social class and economic motive between the philanthropic day care providers of the past and the government officials of today. The ideology of the family is still being used to justify the restriction of day care services, and with a clear purpose in view: given the increasing participation of women in the labour force, free day care for every child who needs it would be an enormously expensive public service.

...it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the government has deliberately, and somewhat cynically, attempted to limit services and manipulate the female labour force.

#### The Present Crisis in Care

At this time, the system of care for our children is fragmented, inconsistent, underfunded and inadequate in the extreme. Child care is considered a private rather than a public responsibility.

Legislation differs across the country. Standards, funding, types of care, administration, delivery of services, all vary from one province to the next.

While grand words in support of day care emanate from the mouths of government ministers the reality is brutal. The Provincial government's avowed policy of cutbacks in the social service field has forced day care centres to close, or be shabbily maintained because of lack of funds. Children are being placed in unsupervised, unlicensed family care arrangements. Corporate enterprise is turning kiddy care into a profit-making, marketable "product". Day care workers are earning poverty-level wages. And the need for daycare spaces has been increasing at an alarming rate. In 1978 almost 50% of mothers with

children aged 3-5 were working and almost 40% of mothers of children below the age of 3.<sup>2</sup> Further, female-headed single-parent families now account for 8.1% of all Canadian families, and an incredible 68% of low-income single parent mothers under the age of 35 have incomes below the poverty line.<sup>3</sup> In Metro Toronto, each month, more than 3500 inquiries are made to the daycare centres - in vain.<sup>4</sup> The vacancies are not there, the long waiting lists are.

The most recent statistics from Health & Welfare Canada detail a dismal picture - only 4.08% of children under the age of 2 with mothers in the labour force are in group care or approved family day care; only 15.46% of children aged 2-6 receive daycare services.<sup>5</sup> Compare this to France where 95% of children aged 3 to 6 attend free pre-school programs, and 32% of children under the age of 3 are cared for in a variety of daycare services. (see Appendix II) In addition, care programs designed for the older child, aged 6-12 are virtually non-existent in Canada. Many of these children who may need care in the early morning, at lunch and after school, are required to fend for themselves.

The most obvious reason for such small numbers of children in daycare, has been the decreasing numbers of day care spaces. "Economic restraint" insured a steady decline in spaces: in 1976, there were 78,153 centres spaces; in 1977, 76,117 spaces; in 1978, 74,516. There has been an increase in 1979 to 84,083 centre spaces, but this growth primarily occurred in the commercial sector, where wages are lower (see section on "Types of Care"). Public centres on the other hand experienced the greatest loss, 3,925 spaces or a 39% decrease since 1978.<sup>6</sup>

It would not be overstating the case to say that our governments' pitiful forays into daycare provision amount to band-aids administered to gaping wounds.

The Need for Care

Over the last few years and particularly during International Year of the Child, increasing attention has been paid to the rights of children: their right to love and understanding, their right to adequate nutrition, freedom from neglect and cruelty, and so on. The United Nations list is impressive, but has very little meaning in reality.

Why is it that during that special year for children we heard little about the crying need for quality, developmental child care? What about the right of children to mix, plan and learn with other children in a warm, caring environment at their most formative age? What about the rights of children to physical, emotional and social development? What about the rights of children to stimulating environments? In other words, what about the rights of children to good day care, which provides all of these things.

Day care is not just a service to working parents, important as that may be. A comprehensive, accessible system of day care services is as important to children today, as the extended family was to the children of former times.

Children today are being raised in the isolation of the nuclear family, with very little community or extended family support. Families are small, so children no longer benefit from interplay with many siblings. Parents who have had virtually no contact with infants or young children are suddenly expected to



know it all, and cope alone. At the same time, more and more literature is produced on the importance of the early years of life, and the need for stimulating and teaching young children. The nuclear family is simply not designed to deal with the rigours of child-raising.

The need for day care is also very much a woman's need. While laudable efforts have been made over the years to involve men in this issue, and to present day care as a family need it is women who stay at home when care is not available; women who come home to look after sick children; women who take part-time jobs to be home after school. The lack of universal day care is inextricably tied up with the unequal position of women in our society.

The recent report Women and Poverty states the following:

One of the reasons women are put in charge of the domestic work is because their husbands have access to higher-paid and more responsible jobs. When wives also get paid jobs, their work outside the home is usually treated as secondary and most are still expected to continue to do the work in the home....

And when child care arrangements fail or a sick child cannot go to school, it is almost always the woman who is expected to bend her work schedule to deal with the crisis.<sup>7</sup>

In other words, women only have access to low-paying, less responsible jobs (which presumably means they don't work as hard) and therefore get the added responsibility of home and children. But because of their work in the home, it is virtually impossible for them to aspire to better positions. It is a vicious circle.

The number of women who are caught in this dilemma are greatly increasing. The female labour force has been experiencing a phenomenal increase in recent years - 78.9 percent between 1965 and 1975. In addition, married women constituted 60 percent of the female labour force in 1975, compared to only 45 percent in 1965. The percentage of single working women during this period declined from 44.5% to 23.2%. Thus there has been a notable shift in the composition of the female labour force from a large proportion of single women to predominantly married women. Women also continue to comprise a disproportionate percentage of part-time workers - 20.3% of women work part-time as compared to 5.1% of men. And still the majority of these women (63%) are clustered into the clerical, sales and service occupations.<sup>8</sup>

Bluntly stated, women and children are suffering from the lack of day care. Their rights are being ignored. It is nothing less than a national disgrace.

#### Funding - Who Pays Now?

The present funding system for day care in Ontario is a complicated one, definitely not designed to aid the proliferation of this service.

The main vehicle for day care funding is the Canada Assistance Plan - which is a cost-sharing plan between the federal and provincial governments. For example, the provincial government will cover 80% of the cost of renovations for a centre, but it receives 50% of this back from the federal government. See Table I below for a description of who pays for what, and also Appendix I.

TABLE I

Type of Cost	Government funding	Other funding
Capital costs		
a) major-new construction	50% provided by Provincial government	50% provided by municipalities, Indian Bands, associations for the retarded, and "approved" non-profit institutions
b) minor-renovations, equipment	50% provided by Federal government, 30% provincial	20% provided by above
Operating costs (day-to-day costs, salaries, etc.)	50% federal, 30% provincial of the fees of families who qualify for subsidy (only one-third of children in Ontario centres are subsidized)	Non-profit and private centres can sign purchase-of-service agreement with municipalities to cover the other 20% of subsidized fees. Not all municipalities offer these agreements. Otherwise, operating costs are totally covered by parent fees

So for example, if a union wished to provide care for its members and found a building near the workplace that was suitable, it would then have to incorporate and apply to the provincial government for the 80% minor capital funding for renovations and equipment. The union would have to be prepared to pay the other 20%, and one other slight hitch, the waiting period for a reply is up to two years.

Also, and very importantly, what an objective discussion of funding like this does not convey, is that the responsibility for providing the centres is in the hands of the municipalities,

Indian bands, and other agencies - and these groups are only going to provide it, if the demand and need is expressed to them by the people, i.e. all of us, the users of the service. There is no law saying that centres must be provided. There is no money automatically available for this service. And so parents must continually fight the same battle every time a new centre is required. Simply put, daycare is not seen as a social right.

Another problem in this area of funding is that of the subsidy system. Families in Ontario, in order to qualify for subsidy must undergo a rigorous needs or means test which is a complicated examination of the family's resources and expenses, usually administered at the local welfare office. This can be a humiliating and demeaning experience. Further, public assistance or welfare rates are used as the ceiling for subsidy so that only the very poor can qualify. This means that only the wealthy or the poor can afford the costs of public centre care, when it is available. (There are only 166 government-controlled centres in the whole of Ontario.)

#### Day Care Workers

The generally forgotten people in the whole discussion of costs and cutbacks are the daycare workers.

In the same way that women in the home receive little recognition for raising children, daycare work is seen as unimportant, unskilled, and inferior. The realities of this work could not be further from such a description. Daycare workers are trained and knowledgeable and work under extremely arduous conditions for paltry wages. With budget tightening in Ontario, equipment which breaks down is not replaced for months, leaving staff to cope with

bored or frustrated children. Workers often have to prepare snacks and do housekeeping work because of short-staffing, which adds to their responsibilities and takes time away from the children. Staff meetings often take place during lunch hours, and coffee breaks are rarely "breaks". As Chris Judge, a Toronto

daycare worker has written:

These unsatisfactory working conditions result in situations where workers can do no more than just cope. They can provide a safe and somewhat stimulating environment, but they are unable to create the enriched experiences that they are trained to provide. Work that should be challenging and stimulating is instead frustrating and tiring. 10

These workers are performing a vital role in our society.

They must no longer be forced to subsidize Ontario's daycare system.

Where are the Children Now?

Parents looking for care for their children basically have three choices - care in a centre, care by a sitter, or care by a relative. Given the cost and unavailability of centre care, the word "choice" is hardly applicable. The average cost of a space in a day care centre in Canada is \$35-\$100 a week per child. The typical cost for a year is \$2600.00 per child.<sup>11</sup> Given this fee, it is understandable that 80-90% of children needing care, are cared for in the home of a sitter along with other children, or by a relative, usually in their own home. See Table II below for details.

TABLE II

Number and Type of Daycare Facilities and Number of Children in Care in Ontario, January 1978

Type	No. of Centres	No. of Children
Municipal centres	166	8,365
Indian Bands	22	657
Non-profit approved corporations	124	3,553
Private-proprietary	1157	46,398
Subsidized approved private home day care	2117 (homes)	3,124
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3586</b>	<b>62,097</b>

Unfortunately, at this time, the majority of private home care providers are not registered, not supervised, not trained, and as a result the quality of much home care has come under serious scrutiny. Studies have shown that children in such settings often lack proper nutritional diets, and lack stimulating programmes and activities.<sup>13</sup> This type of care, however, is accessible and inexpensive.

The quality of care in group day care centres has also been shown to be less stable than previously believed. Because these centres are licensed, and good standards legislated in terms of staff/child ratios, staff qualifications, and proper space, high calibre care has been taken for granted. However a recent research study in Toronto<sup>14</sup> has shown that government cutbacks in funds are creating severe repercussions: staff members are being laid off and vacancies left unfilled; staff hired to work with children are doubling as cooks and cleaners; old furniture and equipment isn't replaced and important repairs aren't made.

It is not surprising then that corporate or commercial day care ventures are seeping into the gap created by government neglect. These notoriously anti-union groups have experienced a phenomenal growth rate of 28% in the past year.<sup>15</sup> Government non-involvement has encouraged corporations to open up chains of day care centres as a business - hamburger day care. A number of these operations have been shown to lower standards in order to increase profit, and have also lobbied the government for a lowering of staff-child ratios. Corporate day care resists the unionization of workers and pays very low wages.

#### Sharing the Caring - Labour's Perspective

Our day care system appears not only inadequate, but primitive and retrogressive when compared to policy in European countries. (see Appendix II). In most of the countries, the majority of children aged 3 to 6 are enrolled in a free, pre-school program on a voluntary basis. For children under three, there exists a wide range of options, from lengthy and paid maternity leaves, to shorter work hours, to extensive provision of day care centres.

Our country is at a virtual standstill when it comes to this critical social service. Now is the time to develop a national, universal, comprehensive system of care for children aged 0-12. A variety of integrated care options must be available, free of charge, to all families wishing to use the services. Social responsibility for child care must be the goal: Day care, like public education, can only become a stable and high quality service if it is funded through public monies.

Day care is not a luxury service for two-income families trying to buy a new frig. Day care is not a welfare service for destitute families or handicapped children. Day care is a necessity, given the exigencies of female employment and changes in family life.

The OFL recognizes and welcomes the changes that are occurring in society and the family. The rigid sex roles of the past are gradually giving way to more humane and flexible sharing of responsibilities, both within and without the home. But women will continue to bear an unequal share of this "liberation" unless day care becomes a common, easily available, quality service.

Women have not had the option to provide care, obtain care, or share care. The OFL is seeking a variety of services which will enable parents to make a free choice - whether to work or to stay at home to look after children, or a combination of both. To this end, the OFL puts forward the following as a suggested comprehensive child care plan:

1. Access to a free, universal service of care for children aged 0-12 be recognized as an essential social right of every family wishing to use the service.
2. Existing facilities should be developed into a pattern of local satellite child care centres which would fulfil the educational and developmental needs of young children in the community. Each centre would act as a training and resource point for registered private home care givers and playgroups in its area, and might also provide some child health services. Advantage should be taken of the falling numbers of school children caused by the drop in the birth rate to convert unused classrooms into centres. Provincial government funding must be made available to these neighbourhood centres to provide a wide range of services, including:
  - a) Group centres located in schools, and also community centres, churches, libraries.



- b) Private home day care, as set out in #5 below.
- c) Part-time care through the group centres, or drop-in facilities and playgroups, with special programmes geared to school age children.
- d) In-home care, for the children of shift workers, for sick children, and night care, as set out in #5 below.
- e) Workplace day care where needed, as set out in #6 below.

3. A tri-level government body should be established to examine the options available in responsibility for the service, particularly involving the provincial Ministries of Social and Community Services, Education, and Culture and Recreation. While delivery of day care services can no longer be meted out like a welfare service as exists under the Ministry of Community and Social Services, neither must it become like the often large, impersonalized, bureaucratic education system. To overcome this, we recommend that mechanisms be instituted which ensure flexibility of approach combined with community control. Parents and workers must have control of decision-making, particularly in such areas as programming and hours. Day care must be adaptable to the needs of its users, not to bureaucratic demand.

4. That the province be committed to fund and assist child care provision when 25 children within a school attendance area require care; such funding must be available only to non-profit and government-operated centres.

5. Private home day care could be organized as part of this system, with the neighbourhood group day care centre as the hub of the wheel, and the family homes as the spokes. Family caregivers would be registered as a condition of public funding, would have employee status along with their group-care counterparts and would share similar benefits and pay. Training programs must also be available to them, preferably through the centres. Similar conditions would exist for in-home care providers who would be available in emergencies, at night and for shift workers, to go into the child's home. These home care providers then have the additional benefit of using the group centre to alleviate their isolation, meet with fellow workers, and learn new skills for working with children.

6. Day care centres, at or near the workplace, where they existed, could also become integrated into this

satellite system and ultimately be funded by the government, rather than employers. The labour movement has always taken the view that the provision of facilities for the care, education and health of children is properly the responsibility of the government. However, it makes eminent sense, given the immediate crisis in day care, to place this issue on bargaining agendas and attempt to negotiate for it. Trade unionists have learned from experience, particularly on the issue of medicare, that negotiating benefits helps put pressure on employers to join in the lobby to have such benefits publicly funded. It is also an excellent way to educate both unions and employers on the subject in order, again, to increase the pressure for government funding. With this in mind, the OFL recommends that where possible, unions consider workplace day care as a negotiating demand, as a tactic or strategy towards our ultimate goal - a universal, free, publicly funded care system. However, we would extend a strong note of caution. Traditionally, the labour movement has been skeptical of workplace day care, seeing it as a means whereby employers can attract young women workers while at the same time offering low rates of pay and poor prospects for training and promotion. It is also feared, that where the union is in a weak position, the employer could use the threat of withdrawal of the service to control the union activities of workers. It could also restrict the mobility of parents and does not solve the problem of after-four care.

Having raised the warning flag we should state that the decision on whether to proceed with a workplace day care centre will fundamentally depend on the nature of the workplace, the attitude of the employer, the structure of the centre, the achievement of satisfactory safeguards within the collective agreement which sets up the centre, and the real commitment of the union and its members to give the time needed to do the job properly.

The following are a few basic principles for unions to keep in mind when negotiating for this benefit:

- a) the union in the workplace must have equal control over the centre along with management and parents.
- b) the fact that a worker has a child in the centre must not hinder her/his promotion or training opportunities at work.
- c) day care staff must be employed on the same terms and with the same qualifications as government-controlled centres.
- d) day care should be available to the children of men and women on an equal basis.

7. The standards set down in the Day Nurseries Act should be regarded as the "minimum"; and persons with education and experience in early childhood education must continue to be the primary staff in day care centres.

8. Day care workers must receive salaries and benefits commensurate with the value of their work and on a par with workers in education, nursing and social work. Unions must make greater efforts to organize day care workers, and to this end, continue the fight for less restrictive labour laws.

9. The provision on day care facilities cannot be seen in isolation. Just as centres can offer parents the opportunity to return to work or education knowing their child is well looked after, it is equally necessary for society to offer a realistic opportunity for parents to remain at home and care for their child at birth and for a reasonable period afterwards. Present leave provisions fail to acknowledge the wish and right of the father to be involved in child rearing and do not account for the severe stress for parents when children are sick. Amendments should include:

a) Paid parental leave available to either parent for the care of a child up to a joint total of one year after birth, or adoption, the last three months to be available only to the father. (Entitlement to leave comes under The Employment Standards Act/ pay under the Unemployment Insurance Act.)

b) Employees receiving such leave will retain and accumulate seniority and have all benefits maintained during such leave.

c) Employees who have been employed with their employer for 6 months will be entitled to such leave.

d) Parents be guaranteed paid leave up to 10 days per year for the care of their children who are ill or who have special needs requiring parental attention.

10. In addition to the demands above, special work-related benefits which take account of the family unit should also be considered by unions in their negotiations with management.

Greater consideration should be given to enabling parents with young children to work on a part-time basis. There may be scope for unions and management jointly to examine the possibility of adapting jobs which management normally regard as full-time jobs so that they can be shared by two workers on a part-time basis through "job-sharing" or "job-

pairing". This must, however, be accompanied by a concerted effort by unions to recruit part-time workers and improve their pay and conditions of employment so that they are at least pro rata to the full-time workers with whom they work. Flexible working hours should be considered, as well as a six-hour day for parents with young children. Overtime should be voluntary, and shift work severely limited.

### Conclusion

The OFL is conscious that the type of comprehensive, universal service which is suggested in this report may take some time to achieve. We do not believe this is a reason for not framing and advancing change we believe is a necessity. Indeed it is our firm conviction that such a daycare service must become a major priority for this country. Anything less will not meet the vital needs of children and their parents.

Time and again pre-school facilities have been demonstrated to be valuable in stimulating the social and emotional development of young children, in relieving family tension that might lead to violence, and in offering employment and education opportunities to parents to improve the material quality of family life.

While the costs of this system will be high, there is no doubt that such a commitment will be offset by the long term social and financial benefits. Providing quality care amounts to prevention rather than cure.

An additional major benefit would be achieved by the many women who would be encouraged to go off welfare payments. (See Appendix III) Not only would this money be saved, but the taxes from the earned income of these women would go a long way to funding the day care service.

It is essential that men and women, governments and the community, unions and management begin to share the caring. Otherwise, it is our children who will suffer. And all of us will pay the price for the damage which is so predictable and, unlike so many things, also so avoidable.

Footnotes

1. This entire section on history is liberally paraphrased and summarized from the following excellent essay: Schulz, Patricia Vandebelt. "Day Care in Canada: 1850-1962", in Good Day Care, ed. Kathleen Gallagher Ross (Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1978), p. 158.
2. Smith, Jean Edward. "Day-care in Toronto here is called 'abysmal'," in Toronto Star, June 26, 1980.
3. National Council of Welfare. Women and Poverty (Ottawa, 1979), p.11.
4. Action Day Care and Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto. Effects of Government Spending Restraints on Day Care Services in Metropolitan Toronto (April, 1980), p.8.
5. Health and Welfare Canada. Status of Day Care in Canada 1979, p.6.
6. Ibid., p.4.
7. National Council of Welfare, op. cit., p.24,25.
8. Labour Canada. Women in the Labour Force Facts and Figures, Part 1, Labour Force Survey. (Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1977), pp. 9, 25, 27, 57.
9. The Day Nurseries Act, 1978, Chap. 72; R.R.O. 160/70 as amended by O.Reg. 380/79.
10. Judge, Chris. "Day Care Workers" in Good Day Care, op. cit., p.135.
11. Clifford, Howard, National Day Care Information Centre, as quoted in Toronto Star, June 23, 1980.
12. Butler, Andrew. "Day Care: A Comparative Perspective". Prepared as a background paper for The National Day Care Task Force. Social Planning Council of Metro Toronto. Mimeo, 1979.
13. Johnson, Laura Climenko. Taking Care. A Report of the Project Child Care survey of Caregivers in Metropolitan Toronto. Joint Project of The Children's Day Care Coalition and the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto. (April, 1978), pp. 169-177 and pp. 252-255.
14. Action Day Care, op. cit.
15. Health and Welfare Canada, op. cit., p. 10.

## APPENDIX I

### DAY CARE IN ONTARIO

TYPES OF PROGRAM	<p>1) <u>Group Day Care</u> - full and part-time at a centre - for handicapped and retarded children.</p> <p>2) <u>Private Home Care</u> - (family day care) - maximum of 5 children.</p> <p>3) Supplementary care programs for school age children - before and after school.</p> <p>4) Private informal care.</p>
NUMBER OF SYSTEMS	Two - 1) Day Care Programs. 2) Kindergarten - under Education
LEGISLATION	Day Nurseries Act 1970 - Revised 1978 - Bill 120.
FUNDING	<p><u>Capital Costs.</u> Only available on request to municipalities, Indian Bands, Association for the retarded and 'approved' non-profit organizations - cost sharing basis between province and these groups - 50% of the cost of new construction - 80% of the cost of renovation paid by the province.</p> <p><u>Operating.</u> Province will provide 80% of daily fees of families who qualify for subsidy through a rigorous needs test, usually administered at the local welfare office.</p>
ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY	<p>Provincial Ministry of Community &amp; Social Services sets standards and regulations; licenses centres and private home care facilities.</p> <p><u>Staff/Child ratios:</u></p> <p>Under 2 yrs. - 1:5 part-time; 1:3 full-time.          2 - 4 yrs. - 1:9 " " ; 1:6 " "          5 yrs. - 1:16 " " ; 1:11 " "          6 - 10 yrs. - 1:15 school days; 1:10 vacation.</p> <p><u>Staff Qualifications:</u>          "sympathetic, suitable, have specialized knowledge and experience"</p> <p><u>Space per Child:</u></p> <p>30 sq. ft. indoors;          40 sq. ft. outdoors - for under 2 yrs. old.          60 sq. ft. " - for 2 - 6 yrs.          75 sq. ft. " - for 6 - 9 yrs.</p> <p><u>Family Day Care:</u>          Maximum of 5 children - no more than two children under age 2 yrs. Premises must comply with municipal health, fire, zoning and building laws - must be inspected at least 4 times a year by supervising government body or agency.</p>

**APPENDIX I cont'd**

RESPONSIBLE LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	National	Minor role via Canada Assistance Plan.
	State/Prov.	Sets policy and standards.
	Local	Implements programs at local level - it is entirely up to the direction of the municipality whether or not to provide public day care.
	Public	Minor provision - 166 centres; Indian Bands 22 centres.
AUSPICE	Voluntary	Some provision by voluntary organizations - non-profit approved corporations for handicapped children or parent co-ops - 124 centres.
	Proprietary	Major provision - 1,157 centres (a few of these are not for profit). Approved Private Home Care - 2,117 homes.
POPULATION COVERAGE	Ontario child population	
	1977 - 0 - 5 yrs. - 734,800	
	1979 - 0 - 5 yrs. - 763,700 (projected estimate)	
	No. of children in day care facilities - Jan. 1978	
	Municipal centres	8,365
	Indian Bands	657
	Non-profit approved corporations	3,553
Private-proprietary	46,398	
		58,973
	Subsidized approved private home day care	3,124
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>62,097</b>
ELIGIBILITY	<p>Selective - public day care is for low income families who prove need</p> <p>- average income families tend to use private or non-profit group day care/family day care or make individual arrangements.</p>	
BUDGET	<p>Day Care Budget - 1978/79 - \$39,551,200.</p> <p>Projected Day Care Budget - 1979/80 - \$42,493,500</p>	

Source: Butler, Andrew. "Day Care: A Comparative Perspective". Prepared as a background paper for The National Day Care Task Force. Social Planning Council of Metro Toronto, Mimeo. 1979.



## APPENDIX II

### SUMMARY OF FAMILY POLICY IN FOUR EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

**Hungary** To the extent that any model is typified by any one country, Hungary's child care policy represents the option of subsidizing women to remain at home to care for their own young children.

Under present policy, the basic package of benefits includes

- a cash maternity benefit paid in a lump sum to the mother when a child is born
- a maternity leave at full pay, with complete job protection, for the 20 weeks following childbirth
- a flat-rate cash allowance payable to the mother for up to thirty-one months after the conclusion of the maternity leave if the woman leaves work to care for her own child.

The flat-rate allowance for one child is equal to about 40 percent of the wage of an unskilled worker and is accompanied by a guarantee of job protection, seniority, and pension entitlements. Since 1974, this allowance has been higher for women having their second and third children than for those having their first because the government is attempting to increase the birthrate. Also, as a result of a tight labor market and a shortage of women in certain industries, the government now permits women receiving child care benefits to interrupt their leave and return to work for part of each year. Working mothers with young children are also entitled to thirty days of paid sick leave to care for an ill child at home.

Day care centers in Hungary have been improved and expanded in recent years, too, so that at present about 12 percent of the children 3 years of age or younger are in care, most of them aged 18 months to 3 years. They receive high-quality care, with a maximum of 15 children in a group, and a recommended ratio of two trained staff members to every ten children. Current plans are to enroll 15 percent of this age group in day care facilities within the next few years. In contrast, 75 percent of children aged 3 to 6 are in all-day preschool programs.

**East Germany** This nation has the most extensive participation of females in the labor force among the countries described here and among the highest rates anywhere in the industrialized world. Eighty-five percent of all adult women work, including those with young children. East Germany is also the best illustration of the extensive use of publicly supported out-of-home child care.

Each East German day care center serves a maximum of ninety children in six groups of fifteen. The children range in age from a minimum of 6 months (more usually about 1 year) to between 2½ and 3. Two or three trained staff members serve each group, depending on the age of the children. Sixty percent of all East German children aged 3 or younger are cared for during the day in these centers. This includes about 80 percent of those aged 1 and 2, who are the major participants in the program. Over 90 percent of these children aged 3 to 6 attend the full-day preschool program, which is often conducted in buildings adjacent to day care centers. Regulations require that new housing developments include day care and preschool facilities, along with schools and other services. Current plans are to expand day care to cover 70 percent of children below the age of 3.

In addition to making this extensive provision of day care, East Germany has expanded its social benefits for mothers. Women are entitled to twenty-six weeks of maternity leave at full net pay, with six weeks to be taken before childbirth and twenty after. Women are also entitled to remain at home on an unpaid but job-protected leave until the child is a year old. If a day care placement is unavailable,

single parents are provided a cash benefit at a flat rate equal to about 40 percent of the average wage so that they may provide home care until a placement is available.

**France** This country best illustrates the third policy option: a partial subsidy through which parents can obtain either out-of-home child care or income replacement, thus making it theoretically possible for them to exercise individual choice more freely than would be possible otherwise.

For low-income families with at least one child under the age of 3, the French government provides an income-tested cash benefit in the form of a special supplementary family allowance (*complément familial*). This allowance can be used as the parents wish—to purchase child care so that both parents can work or to supplement family income when only one parent works. In addition, the government provides a sixteen-week maternity leave at full net pay for employed women and gives them the option of taking some of this leave time before childbirth. The program also provides a flat-rate cash grant to mothers on the birth of a child.

The government supplements these benefits with the most extensive out-of-home child care services offered in any Western European country. The first feature of this program is an extraordinary free preschool system that serves 95 percent of children aged 3 to 6 (and 27 percent of 2 year olds) on a voluntary basis, whether or not their mothers work. A substantial number of these schools also provide the children of working mothers with some sort of care before and after normal school hours, at lunchtime, and on school holidays. The second feature is the unusually wide coverage provided for children under the age of 3, in a combination of preschool programs, day care centers, and family day care arrangements. Almost one-third of this age group—and half the children of working mothers—are served through these various programs. This includes 12 percent who are enrolled in some form of group program and 20 percent who receive licensed family day care.

Source: this is a summary, but directly quoted from the following article:  
Sheila B. Kamerman and Alfred J. Kahn, "Comparative Analysis in Family Policy: A Case Study," Social Work, November 1979, pp.506-512.

**Sweden** Policy in Sweden illustrates the fourth option: the restructuring of social conditions to permit a closer integration of work and family life for all adults.

The exceptionally high quality of Sweden's publicly subsidized programs is known throughout the world. Its facilities for child care are beautifully designed, well equipped, and extensively staffed.

What is less well known is that even now, enrollment in these programs is relatively low—certainly the lowest among the five countries considered in this survey. About half the children from the age of 3 to the age of 7 (which is the age at which compulsory school attendance begins in Sweden) are served by day care centers or preschools, and about 23 percent of children under the age of 3 are covered by these programs or by family day care. In addition, Sweden is expanding its supplementary programs for children in primary schools.

In the late 1960s and 1970s, another factor became significant in Swedish family policy: a growing stress on equality between the sexes.

It is in this context that the government instituted a system known as Swedish Parent Insurance in 1974 to replace the maternity benefit formerly provided under health insurance. The new system of coverage, which has been expanded somewhat since being introduced, provides a parent with a taxable cash benefit equal to full wages for 9 months following the birth of a child. (A minimum benefit, derived from health insurance, is provided for women who are not in the labor force.) A portion of the benefit can be taken by the mother prior to the expected time of the birth. Except for any portion paid before childbirth, the benefit is available to either parent, if both parents are employed.

Moreover, parents can share the benefit or, if they prefer, use it to cover part-time work. For example, a woman might use the benefit to cover four months of full-time leave after childbirth. Her husband might then take two months of full-time leave. Each might then, in turn, work two months at half time, and then two months at three-quarters time (a 6-hour work day). Employers are required to grant part-time employment to workers who have young children.

In this way, both parents can actively participate in caring for the baby until his or her first birthday, or even a little after.

APPENDIX III

---

**TITLE XX—CATCH 22 IN 10 EASY STEPS**

1. Single mother goes on welfare.
2. Puts her child on waiting list for public child care.
3. 4–6 months later, puts her child in public day-care center.
4. Starts job training.
5. One year later, completes training
6. Looks for a job for 4 months.
7. Gets a job!!
8. Told she is no longer eligible for public child care; income from new job too high.
9. Quits her job; so-called high income not enough for private child care; goes back on welfare.
10. Starts working with other parents to **FIGHT BACK!!!**

—from Nine to Five