The Ontario Federation of Labour together with members of the Ontario Coalition for Better Daycare presented the brief Daycare Deadline: 1990 to Premier William Davis and members of the Cabinet on November 9, 1981. Davis' response to the brief was sympathetic but with no real commitments. He said he would have no disagreements with us on the need and desirability of daycare. Clearly how much and how soon is another story. He said the government would look into two areas that were put forward in the brief: the matter of changing the jurisdiction of daycare from the Ministry of Community and Social Services to the Ministry of Education; and the proposal for a task force to initiate pilot projects to ascertain how specific needs can best be met. On the latter proposal however, he said he would be in favour of this only if the task force would look into alternatives besides those presented in the brief.

The only Cabinet Minister who responded was Frank Drea,
Minister of Community and Social Services. His response ended up
being a low-key rebuttal to the proposals in the brief. He said
the government was looking at alternatives to the present daycare
structure, but he did not get specific. The following are several
points he mentioned which seem to be part of possible alternatives;
parents need to be involved; there should be a less rigidly
structured provision of care; special needs of handicapped
children; retention of the needs test - subsidized spaces must be
available for those who need it most; collective bargaining for
daycare; need for a broad public education program. He was negative

on the direct grant since it is for all and would therefore in his opinion benefit middle income earners and not those who need it most.

The overall sense we were left with after this exchange, is that the government is tending to move in very different directions from those in the brief. There is recognition that daycare has become a social issue that must be addressed, but no willingness at all to move towards universal accessibility. Rather family care providers and profit-making daycare operations will continue to be a large part of the system, as well as parent fees. There may be some provision of more spaces, but we expect too little too late. All in all it was the typical response of Davis' brand of conservatism - give just enough on social issues to keep the Wolves at bay, but maintain the status quo as much as possible, and never change the system.

The lobby of MPP's afterwards was an extremely useful and educational exercise. Lobbyists were placed in groups of three or four and given four MPP's from various parties to lobby. The intent was to give the member a copy of the brief, outline the main points, get some sense of their support or non-support, and thereby lay the groundwork for these same members being lobbied in their own constituencies by the local daycare coalitions. Each group reported on the responses of their members at a meeting held immediately after the lobby. Four groups did not report back (i.e. 16 members). Individual responses are given very briefly in the attached summary.

The New Democratic Party was the most supportive - 12 out of 13 lobbied supported all the points in the brief. Many were knowledgeable on the issue, and stated that it was NDP policy. Four NDP members were not available to meet with lobbyists.

Liberal responses were much more mixed. Responses ran the gamut from interest and support (six) to non-committal (8) to downright negative (2). There was no sense of party policy. Concerns were raised around costs, and who should provide care (e.g. employers, private homes). Ten liberals did not make themselves available for the lobbyists.

There was also a variety of opinions among the Conservatives, with the majority being either non-committal or negative (14) and four (4) being supportive. There seemed to be a tendency to tow the government line, although several conservative members went well beyond that by dredging up the old saw that a woman's place is in the home. Several were negative on the direct grant, and several were supportive of the idea of a task force. Thirty-one (31) did not make themselves available to the lobbyists, including Barlow who kept lobbyists waiting an hour and then never did meet with them; Wells who needed three weeks notice before a meeting; McLean who ran past lobbyists who tried to approach him and Kells who would not speak to lobbyists since they weren't from Humber.

In conclusion, neither the Conservatives nor Liberals have a clear position on the issues, the response to the direct grant is primarily negative except from the NDP, some additional spaces may be coming, and the task force will be discussed in Cabinet.

CONSERVATIVE RESPONSES TO LOBBY

Ernie Eves (Parry Sound)

- was concerned that the \$5 direct grant would go to those who already can afford daycare

Ogie Villeneuve (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry)

- represents a rural area with traditional family structure and extended family supports; concerned about the number of young unmarried women in his riding who have young children.

John Williams (Oriole, Parliamentary Asst. to the Minister of Revenue)

- concerned that universal daycare would allow moms to opt out of their responsibility to nurture children; would not support \$5 direct grant, but felt that more spaces could be supported.

Andy Watson (Chatham-Kent, Parl. Asst. to the Minister of Community and Social Services)

- agreed that parents should be ultimate responsibility for education of young children; said the direct grant would give assistance to sons of Trudeau and Clark, not to those who most needed it; discussion degenerated into problem of people on social services ripping off the welfare system.

Margaret Scrivener (St. David)

- supports hub model and more spaces but not on government money - rather we should be original and inventive, e.g. use women volunteers

Russell Ramdry (Secretary for Resources Development)

- supportive of daycare but not knowledgeable; supports task force; has no constituents on daycare waiting list.

Jim Gordon (Sudbury, Parl. Asst. to the Minister of Health)

- seemed to understand problem, agreed there is change in society; supportive of task force; said he would read brief and get back to them.

Michael Harris (Nipissing)

- reached by telephone; said he would read brief and get back to them.

Jim Pollock, (Hastings-Peterborough)

- sympathetic but will vote against - believes daycare should be funded by municipality.

Bruce McCaffrey (Armourdale, Minister without Portfolio)

- agrees there is need for daycare, but there are problems with priorities; approves of task force - would like to head it; not an issue in his riding.

Terry Jones (Mississauga North, Parl. Asst. to Minister of Treasury and Economics)

- supports in essence, but questioned cost; will discuss it in caucus.

Phil Gillies (Brantford, Parl. Asst. to the Secretary to Social Development)

- quite positive and supportive; would pursue task force in legislature; willing to meet labour council and interested groups in his riding.

William Hodgson (York North, Parl. Asst. to the Minister of Government Services)

- thinks most parents neglect kids and live beyond their means.

Larry Grossman (St. Andrew-St. Patrick, Minister of Industry & Tourism)

- says we should keep up the pressure; there is pressure on the PC's to tow the government line; holds "dinner" yearly with daycare people; is aware of need in his constituency; negative on task force.

Bud Gregory (Mississauga East, Minister without Portfolio)

- very negative, does not believe in subsidized care; said he will agree with whatever Drea says.

Mickey Hennessy (Fort William, Parl. Asst. to Minister of Northern Affairs)

- believes there should be better wages and daycare in schools.

Don Cousens (York Centre)

maybe on task force.

Gordon Walker (London South, Prov. Sec. for Justice & Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations)

- doesn't meddle in other Minister's jurisdiction (i.e. Drea's).

UNAVAILABLE CONSERVATIVES

Roy McMurtry (in Edmonton) (Eglinton)

Lorne C. Henderson, Minister of AGriculture & Food (Lambton)

Robert C. Mitchell (in Ottawa, Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary
(Carlton) for Justice and Minister of Consumer & Commercial
Relations

Robert W. Runciman, Leeds

Reuben Baetz (Ottawa West)

Claude Bennett, Minister of Municipal Affairs & Housing (Ottawa South)
Bill Barlow, Cambridge (lobbyists waited one hour to see him while he
was on phone - never did get to see him)

Robert Welch, Minister of Energy (Brock)

Thomas L. Wells, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (lobbyists told (Scarborough North) they would need 3 weeks notice to see Wells)
Richard Treleaven, Oxford (would respond by letter (see attached)
Ross Stevenson, Durham York (lobbyists made appt. to see him but when they returned he was not available)

Yuri Shymko, High Park-Swansea (lobbyists missed him due to time taken with another MPP)

George Taylor, Simcoe Centre

David Roten berg, Wilson Heights, Asst. to Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Howard Sheppard, Northumberland

Allan McLean, Simcoe East (ran past lobbyists who tried to approach him) Ronald McNeil, Elgin, Parl. Asst. to the Minister of Agriculture & Food Rene Piche, Cochrane North

Robert Eaton, Middlesex, Parl. Asst. to the Minister of Transportation and and Communications

Frank S. Miller, Minister of Treasury and Economics (Muskoka)
George McCague, Dufferin-Simcoe, Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet
George Kerr, Burlington South

Nicholas Lebuk, Monister of Correctional Services, York West Robert Macquarrie, Carleton East, Parl. Asst. to the Solicitor-General

UNAVAILABLE (continued)

Morley Kells, Humber (would not speak to lobbyists since they weren't from Humber)

John Lane, Algoma-Manitoulin, Parl. Asst. to the Minister of Industry and Tourism

Al Kolyn, Lakeshore

Jack Johnson, Wellington-Dufferin-Peel

Susan Fish, St. George, Parl. Asst. to the Minister of Culture & Recreation Edward Havrot, Temiskaming

Leo Bernier, Kenora, Minister of Northern Affairs (saw his assistant who doesn't think Northern Ontario has daycare problems)

Alan Pope

LIBERAL RESPONSES TO LOBBY

Robert Nixon (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk)

- supportive at first but waffled at the end as to who would bear the cost Gordon Miller (Haldimand-Norfolk)

- mothers are the best persons to look after their children.

Hugh Edighoffer, (Perth)

- knew nothing, non-responsive to issue, was getting no pressure from constituents.

Murray Elston (Huron Bruce) Shellagh Copps

- receptive, asked for facts and figures so they can question in Legislature.

Jack Riddell (Huron-Middlesex)

- says he and his party will support.

Jim Bradley (St. Catharines)

- fairly receptive - says Smith has spoken favourably - will raise the issue in caucus - not a concern in his riding - task force better than select committee.

James Breithaupt (Kitchener)

- non-commital

Harry Worton (Wellington South)

- sympathetic but not knowledgeable - he feels basic problem is poor status given to childcare workers.

Richard Ruston (Essex North)

- non-commital

John Sweeney (Kitchener-Wilmot)

- agrees to immediate need - but very concerned about word "universal"

David Peterson (London Centre)

- favourable to daycare but feels it is responsibility of employer - would back task force.

Robert McKessock (Grey)

- non-commital, concerned about funding.

Vince Kerrio (Niagara Falls)

- supports concept and his party will .

John Eakins (Victoria-Haliburton)

- supports daycare - his daughter has to leave daycare field because of poor wages.

Ray Haggerty (Erie)

- supports further study - possibly the task force, seemed to prefer private home care.

Eric Cunningham (Wentworth North)

- sees problems with task force (takes time with no results).

UNAVAILABLE

Tony Ruprecht - his assistant said he was very supportive. (Parkdale)

Albert Roy (Ottawa East)

Julian Reed (Halton-Burlington)

Hugh O'Neil (Quinte)

Herbert Epp (Waterloo North)

Bernard Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)

James McGuigan (Kent-Elgin)

Earl McEwen (Frontenac-Addington)

Remo Mancini (Essex South)

Sean Conway (Renfrew North)

NDP RESPONSES TO LOBBY

Donald MacDonald (York South)

- fully conversant, fully supportive.

Marion Bryden, (Beaches-Woodbine)

- fully supportive and knowledgeable; will send Drea's response to 1980 initiatives and estimates for Drea's Ministry to organizers; she asked questions in the Legislature during Question Period on November 9.

Bud Wildman, (Algoma)

- supportive, will confirm by letter.

Mel Swart, (Welland-Thorold)

- fully supportive.

Ed Philip (Etobicoke)

- supportive; would support select committee rather than task force.

Elie Martel (Sudbury East)

- supportive.

Robert Mackenzie (Hamilton East)

- supportive; questioned task force, felt more lobbying would be better approach.

Tony Lupusella (Dovercourt)

- would make no commitments.

Floyd Laughren (Nickel Belt)

- sympathetic.

Tony Grande, (Oakwood)

- supportive, proposed private members bill on daycare; critical issue in his riding because there is no daycare; believes in educative value of daycare.

Jim Foulds, (Port Arthur)

- very supportive, gave them NDP policy on daycare.

Brian Charlton (Hamilton Mountain)

- supportive, has brought it up in Legislature.

David Cooke (Windsor-Riverside)

- the most immediate problem right now in Windsor is unemployment (28%)

Mike Breaugh (Oshawa)

- knowledgeable, supportive of task force; felt it is important to keep public awareness high.

UNAVAILABLE

George Samis, Cornwall (in Cornwall)

Michael Cassidy (in Ottawa) spoke to an assistant who supports the (Ottawa Centre) direct grant and the task force; feels daycare should be integrated with the workplace.

Ross McClellan (out of town) (Bellwoods)
Richard Johnston (Scarborough-West)



Dowder PRESS CLIP Kitchener-Weterloo Rec Kitchener, Drit. D. Cire 72,000

> MGY 7 19 owden's Information Sen

Pour more money into

ede

CTILL

re at to Ario mar

TOPONTO, ONTARIO The Globe & Mail B. Circ. 264,909

A coalition of Ontario labor, education and women's groups demanding expended day-care demanding expended a sympathetid scalities has got a sympathetid rear but no commitments from Premier William Davis.

The Ontario Coalition for Better Day Care, which represents

The Ontario Coalition for Betiter Day Care, which represents is associations and unions, presented a brief to the Ontario Cabinet yesterday calling for universally accessible day care universally accessible creation of universally accessible day care by 1990, immediate creation of 10,000 subsidized day-care space. es and a Government study on

es and a Government study on day the needs.

or of the brief, Mr.

eral tenor of the brief, Mr.

Davis said. "You're not going to

Davis said. "You're not going up get any argument from me about the need for day care."

But I 'can't guarantee' you'that we can meet the full effect of the brief by 1990. Our problem of the brief by 1990. Our problem that we can meet the juli enem of the brief by 1990. Our problem of the price by 1990. Our proposed in government is to determine what the priorities are and what percentage of the budget should

be allocated," said Mr. Davis, who listened along with eight of who listened along with eight of his Cabinet ministers to the configuration's demands.

clifford Pilkey, president of the Ontario Federation of Labor, who headed the delegation, said the need for both parents to hold the need for both parents to noid down jobs has changed the traditional nature of the family and ional nature of the family and increased demand for day care. Levels of government funding are totally inadequate. What is required to a massive increase.

is required is a massive increase, is required is a massive increase, in funding and a universally accessible day-care system.

The oscillator which collected. accessible day-care system.
The coalition, which collected about 200 submissions from inte-

about 200 submissions from inte-rested groups during the past six months, criticized the means test applied to applicants for subsi-applied to applicants for subsi-dized day care and recommend-dized day care and recommend-

pread of those who need it most.

In defending the current expenditures of his ministry, mr. or converse said. Tax cuts. You just here wants it both ways. Oreen Gordon, president of the Ontario branch of the Associtation for Early Childhood Education for Education for Education for Education for Early Childhood Education for Educati nich represents and unions, accessible

immediate subsidized the Ontario branch of the Association for Early Childhood Education for Early Childhood workers with the should be unionized and be paid brief, said day-care who should be unionized and the should be unionized and the soing on a par with teachers and soing on a par with training and on the soing of the

The coalition also said parents should get financial support to should get financial support to feer stay at home with their children be and legislation should be enacted to provide extended naid major. experience." to provide extended paid mater

BILL DAVIS rested groups out the means test months, criticized the for subsitements, criticized the for subsitements to provide extended paid material to provide extended paid to provide the extended paid to pr

CLIFFPILKEY purposes and legislation enacted to provide for extended paid maternity and paternity it also for extended leave. It also for entres to the creation of centres created on the same basis as elementary schools:

centres — created on the sam basis as elementary schools: About 200 members of the

Mictoria, B.Q.

NGV 11 1981

Day care

TORONTO (CP) -Within 10 years, all preschool children should have the right to attend universally accessible of ful day care just as all older quat children have the right to ther attend public schools, systemays a brief to the Ontario water cabinet.

abinet.
The brief, written by 18 labor, education and social groups, said day-care centres should be located in neighborhoods, just as elementary facil

ay care is a social need -- unionist Since the turn of the century, the number of women in the labor force has quadrupled. More than balf the adult females in Canada are now working outside the home, and many have joined unions,

which are paying more attention than ever to "women's issues." The four main issues of concern to women are day care, job discrimination, maternity leave, and sexual harassment - probably in that order.

If a woman with children under school age can't arrange to have them looked after during the day, she can't even begin to look for a he can even begin to look for a job. Once she starts looking, she may be denied the kind of job she wants, and is qualified for, by employers who discriminate against

Higher priorities

Then, even after she lands a job she may be refused adequate maternity leave, or be denied promotion because she won't submit to sexual harassment.

Unions — especially those with large numbers of female members have started giving a higher priority to these four problems in recent years, often with the support of women's groups and social welfare agencies.



FINN Opinion on Labor

Most of the emphasis, though, has been on the need for more and better day care, which is seen as the No. I issue for women in the 1980s.
A strong and vocal coalition, spearbeaded by the Ontario Federation of Labor (OFL), has been beating the day-care drum for the past year or so.

The coalition recently presented manding universally accessible day-care services for all pre-school daycare services for an pre-school children in the province. It set forth \$10-year-timetable, for achieving that goal Public reaction has been (to put

it mildly) mixed. The government, of course, says it would be too costly. Other critics contend that families, other than those in poverty, should pay for and find their own days are facilities.

day-care facilities. Some married women who have chosen to stay home and rear their children seem to resent the expen-

diture of their

care of working women's children.
These attitudes stem from longheld assumptions about family life that no longer apply. The concept of, the "typical" family, with the husband working and the wife slay. ing at home with the kids, is now obsolete. So is the notion that, be-cause you have children, it's your responsibility alone to look after

Changing families

The typical family today is more likely to be one in which both parents work, whether through choice or necessity; or a single-parent lamily; or an unmarried couple with children. Only one family in 10

still fits the old-fashioned image. The argument that day care services for working women shouldn't be subsidized by people without children, or by families in which the mather state families in which the mother stays home, does n't stand up to scrutiny. It's basically the same kind of opposition advanced against other universal so-cial security programs — that they should be financed only by those

who use them. But it is clearly beneficial for society as a whole to have Medicare, to have a public pension plan, and to have unemployment in

The same is true for day e The Metro Toronto Social Son department did a study. It for that every dollar spent on days saved more than \$2 in was costs, if it enabled a woman tope

Unions and women's organe tions now refer to the day care tern as being in a crisis, because so fragmented, inconsistent, i quate and underfunded. Only size 5 per cent of children under the of 2 with mothers in the labor fire

are in approved family day care.

Most nations in Europe are ahead of us. In France, for an a

grams of Country is virtually a standstill in meeting day-car-heeds," says the OFL. "The strugger for day care in the 1980s is no eximportant than the earlier struggli for public education."

But it's not just a "women's issue" any more. It's a growing, ugent social need whose continued neglect can only spawn more more broken homes, more juvenis-delinquency, more welfare, and more social unrest.