

**KIDS FIRST PARENT ASSOCIATION OF CANADA SUBMISSION
ENHANCING PRODUCTIVITY GROWTH IN CANADA
PRE-BUDGET CONSULTATIONS, 2005**

GOAL: Increase “Productivity PLUS Standard of Living:” GDP, productivity and efficiency increases do not directly correlate to increased standard of living (SOL), and can often degrade SOL. Increasing productivity and efficiency should be goals undertaken only to improve SOL.

MEANS: increased recognition and financing of unpaid child care sector.

BACKGROUND - A – CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

1 – “LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION” (LFP)

Policy is being based on inaccurate information: “70 per cent of mothers are working.” This gives the false impression that parents are NOT available to do child care and are assumed to need daycare.

This comes from Statistics Canada’s Labour Force (LF) SURVEY [1]

LFP figures are not measures of “need for daycare”, or “work” full time, paid, or outside the home. LF includes “employed” and “unemployed”.

As “employed” it includes:

- absent from job due to paid or unpaid PARENTAL OR MATERNITY leave, laid off, holiday, illness, any other form of absence
- UNPAID WORK – any amount – in family farm or business
- PART TIME WORK - no minimum amount of time of pay
- self-employed (ie those who are not ‘employed’ by an employer)
- As UNEMPLOYED it includes those on EI and/or looking for work.

Mothers who are do jobs at home while children are present are also included.

2– “CHILD CARE”

COMPARING APPLES AND ORANGES. Definitions of “Child Care” are very elastic result in the false impressions that (a) most children are in daycare, (b) most Canadians want daycare, and (c) that daycare provides huge developmental benefits.

When we read that children benefit from high quality “early learning and child care” this is based definitions of child care very different from the definitions applied when it comes to funding. Common sense tells us children benefit from good care and learning. Studies of institutionalized Romanian orphans deprived of care and monkeys reared without mothers also demonstrate this.

The huge US Study National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development defined child care to include ALL NON-MATERNAL care OVER 10 hrs/wk– eg. fathers’ and grandparents’ care.

- Stats Canada’s *National Child Care Study: Where are the Children?* defined it as care other than by a mother who is not at work, so care by mother on the job is called “SUPPLEMENTAL CARE”.
- Stats Can also defines child care as “non-parental care while parents work or study”: this excludes 12% (1995) of children whose parents are said not to “work or study”, and it includes all forms of care which are NOT daycare: kindergarten, father, nanny, etc.
- The daycare lobby (eg Child Care Advocacy Assoc) defines it as participation in any program, from mother-baby drop-ins, to 2 mornings/wk of preschool, to full day full week in a daycare centre.
- Polls that show popular support for “child care” are dependent on not defining the term at all. “According to a 1998 Environics poll [for the Canadian Policy Research Network], 76% of Canadians agree with the statement: ‘A child-care system should be available for all families, with the costs shared

by government and the families themselves.’ Participants in focus groups called for a flexible definition of the term ‘child-care system’...when the question is whether a child-care system of some sort [emphasis in original] should be available to all families [this includes ‘pay parents to stay at home’], a consensus emerges.” [2]

FOR FUNDING PURPOSES, however, CHILD CARE is inflexibly defined so that DAYCARE CENTRE CARE receives by far the most funding and ALL care outside of government monitoring is without explanation cut off from the definition:

- BC Benefits – Child Care - Act : “non-parental care”

- In the EARLY LEARNING AND CHILD CARE Agreement in Principle between Ontario and the federal government “Areas for Investment” says the funds are for “regulated programs and services are defined as those that meet the quality standards that are established and monitored by the Gov’t of Ontario.” “Early learning and child care programs and services are defined as those supporting direct care and early learning for children in such settings as child care centres, family child care homes, preschools and nursery schools.”[3]

3 – “QUALITY”:

The “quality” of care children receive affects their outcomes as adults and therefore directly affects “social and “human capital formation.” This is almost universally agreed. However, THERE ARE NO STUDIES SHOWING LONGTERM DEVELOPMENTAL BENEFITS OF DAYCARE OVER PARENTAL AND OTHER CARE FORMS.

The US NICHD study determined that “quality” of non-maternal care has “modest but meaningful” impact on **assessed cognitive** outcomes at school-entry.[4] Maternal sensitivity is the greatest predictor of outcomes, and maternal sensitivity decreases with time in low quality non-maternal care.

Behaviour/social outcomes: The NICHD study showed that longer hours in daycare centres, produces higher rates of non-compliance and aggression.[5]

Emotional/health outcomes: The NICHD study showed that children’s stress related brain chemical levels worsen with hours in daycare. [6] Daycare increases children’s rates of infection and illness.

Stress chemicals raise concerns because this is related to dramatically increased levels of alcohol and cocaine abuse in studies of rats deprived of maternal care.[7]

These increases are also associated with higher rates of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome.[8]

Canada’s leading daycare advocates state that the majority of **government-licensed care** “is of *minimal to mediocre quality*,”[9] and “*The majority of children age 0-12 in centres do not receive adequate amounts or types of experiences to promote language and cognitive development.*”[10]

-These assessments were made of daycares that volunteered for the study and had child:staff ratios much lower than allowable ratios. : 1:2.6 for infant/toddlers to 1:4.8 for preschool age.

- **QUALITY IS WORSE SINCE THE STUDY because allowable RATIOS HAVE BEEN INCREASED for one year-olds in most provinces (1: 8 Quebec.)**[11]

“Quality” concerns and the developmental research that shows better care produces better outcomes FOR CHILDREN are dismissed by some leading international daycare advocates: “*Definitions of quality cannot be based on empirical research*” [emphasis in original], states the European Commission Network on Childcare and Other Measures to Reconcile Employment with Family Responsibilities.

They **recommend disregarding developmental science and attachment theory as culturally biased** and say definitions of quality depend on “core values” and “goals”. [18] If these goals and values do not include good outcomes for children, then it follows that the research, such as the NICHD study, must be ignored. This is why these studies are being ignored in Canadian child care policy. This jeopardizes long term productivity and social functioning because it places children’s outcomes secondary to other “goals” such as increasing Labour Force Participation and full time employment rates of their mothers

BACKGROUND - B - SWEDISH DAYCARE AND THE OECD

The Swedish Min. of Education report “Pre-school in Transition” [12] indicates that QUALITY has been sacrificed to financial considerations, staff: child ratios are outrageous now at 10-22:1 for 1-3 yr olds. The report states that the goals of the daycare policy INCLUDING LEARNING are being undermined by:

- the large number of children per staff
- developmentally inappropriate school-like methods.

Yet the OECD - which is guiding Canada’s daycare agenda - perversely “holds up the Swedish pre-school as a model....providing great respect for the child” (p.35) (“pre-school” is their term for daycare).

QUOTING THE SWEDISH REPORT “Pre-school in Transition”:

- the situation is “*a development that was hardly intended*” (p. 19).
- “*the size of the group... has pedagogical consequences*” (p. 21-22)
- “*it is mainly financial constraints which steer decisions on group size*” (p.21)
- “*different meanings are attributed to the concept of learning*” (p 39)
- “*In a compilation of international research, experiences from different countries with different forms of pre-schooling and different ages for starting school are compared. Amongst other things, it appears that formal learning at an early stage – where there is little scope for the child to explore and use his/her own initiative – may have a negative effect on the child’s self-esteem and motivation to learn and negatively impact the child’s own learning over a longer time perspective.*”
- “the National Agency for Education considers that *excessive emphasis placed on formal learning at an early stage can have negative consequences.*”
- “It is thus *important to have a more meaningful dialogue ... concerning what the terms “development” and “learning” mean for children between the ages of 1–5 in the pre-school.*”(p40)

BACKGROUND – C- OFFICIAL DE-RECOGNITION OF UNPAID CHILD CARE WORK

“*in 1881 the Census excluded women’s household chores from the category of productive work and for the first time housewives were classified as unoccupied. Before these changes in policy, the economic activity rates for both men and women had been recorded as equal at about 98 per cent, now only 42 per cent of women were perceived officially to be contributing to the economy.*”[13]

The OECD refers to mothers who are not in the LF as “inactive” and “non-active” in papers presented at the 2004 “Putting More Women to Work: a Colloquium on Employment, Child Care and Taxes”.

Oft-cited University of Toronto daycare economists Cleveland and Krashinski state in HRDC funded paper “The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care: the Economic Rationale for Investment in Young Children” states that: “*the cost to society of this arrangement [mothers caring for their children] – essentially the LOSS to the labour force of the talent of an enormous number of young women – was considerable....the old labour-intensive way of caring for children...is no longer viable.*”[14] These claims have been accepted and shaped without adequate assessment.

De-recognition has taken place while responsibilities and costs (time, money, energy) have dramatically increased due to concerns from molestation to education to media to pollution: homework, enrichment activities, supervision, transportation, monitoring, health and safety practices.

BACKGROUND – D - LOSS OF FINANCING FOR UNPAID CHILD CARE

In the recent past, more financing of this sector's work was provided through Family Allowance and Tax Deductions for spouse and dependent children than the present current combined expenditures in CTB, NCB Supplement and costs of the CCED. Total Child Tax Benefit and National Child Benefit expenditures were \$7.7 billion in 2001.[15] This is less than equivalent expenditure of the \$20/month/child Family Allowance of the 1970s which now would be worth over \$1200/child/yr and about \$7.86 billion annually in 2004 dollars (based on 6.55 million children age 0-17[16]), and there were also deductions for all dependants.

Welfare to families with dependent children had also been reduced: eg in BC parents are ineligible when youngest child is 3 – down from age 7. In Alberta it is age 6 months.

Employment Benefits (spousal, medical, death, disability) were originally intended to help finance this CHILD CARE work and related expenses – not to reward people for co-habiting. This was stated in parliamentary “BEYOND CONJUGALITY” reports a few years ago. Extending the category of entitled recipients to include both opposite and same sex ‘common law’ partnerships, regardless of the presence of children, and continuing the policy of providing benefits to married childless couples benefited growing numbers of non-parents and reduced funds available for parents.

Additionally, as “non-standard” work and family practices grew, growing numbers of parents and children were not covered by these benefits: self-employed, lone parents, etc.

In the past, employers also helped finance this work by preferentially treating family “bread-winners” with promotions and raises. Now the higher financial needs of those supporting children are no longer a factor.

The result is the ludicrous situation of high double-income-no-kids couples with generous multiple benefits packages, and parents and children with minimal medical benefits only.

PROBLEMS WITH CURRENT MEASURES AND DEFINITIONS

1 - ‘PAID WORK’ VS ‘FINANCED UNPAID WORK’

Being UNPAID does not mean being UNFINANCED. Related practices: PAYING for the work of foster parents, politicians, soldiers.

2 - **GDP** increases regardless of whether or not the goods and services (G&S) produced are ‘good’ or not: leaky condos, botched surgery, etc. It increases with G&S that, while desired by some, are harmful to others, and are considered socially harmful for SOL – eg casinos, pornography, prostitution.

The GDP also increases with production of G&S needed to deal with disasters and all other harms: oil spills, suicide, cancer surgery, terrorism, murder, addiction services, police, prisons, etc.

The GDP does not take into account unquestionable good and/or socially ESSENTIAL G&S: breast-feeding, breast milk, gestation, LABOUR, birth, most care work, prevention services, etc.

The GDP also increases as G&S are TRANSFERRED from the UNPAID uncommodified sector to the commodified sector. This loss is interpreted as “growth”.

This means that there is far too much “*opportunity in devastation*”[17] while much essential and unquestionably “good” G&S are not counted as existing at all.

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY: the ability of society to maintain and reproduce itself in a manner that does not create more harms than benefits, and in sufficient numbers. It has been noted that for the first time in history, we are reversing evolution and producing children who are less healthy and more-anti-social than the previous generation. The LOW BIRTH RATE (under 1.5 children per woman) means we are not even maintaining our population.

The result is an artificial economic POLICY DISSENSITIVE to even recognizing unpaid work. This results in social harms that in turn create more GDP work for the harm-reduction/devastation industries. SOL and GENUINE PRODUCTIVITY are impaired.

FUNDING CHILD BENEFITS RATHER THAN DAYCARE **RECOGNIZING THE UNPAID SECTOR**

The unpaid sector is primarily responsible for CARE GIVING WORK of all types. Unpaid child care sector is one of the least recognized yet most highly productive and is ESSENTIAL to the economy/society.

1 - HIGH PRODUCTIVITY OF UNPAID CHILD CARE SECTOR:

-MULTI-TASKING and MULTIPLE USE OF HUMAN AND PHYSICAL CAPITAL:

-the physical care, safety, education, socialization and enculturation of the children from pre-conception to adulthood is accomplished

-other care giving: care of family, community, friends: elders, handicapped, sick, dying
-cleaning work

-hygiene services: the need for it is lessened due to the fact that many children from various families are not together all day

-medical services: prevention, care, treatment, auxiliary service to paid medical sector

-food, purchasing, administrative, banking, payroll, transportation, property maintenance

-policing – presence of these workers in community reduces and monitors crime

-increased property values – provide “community spirit/feel”

-formal volunteering: sports, religious, ethnic, school, cultural, hospital, arts, etc.

-informal volunteering: advising, teaching, help of all kinds

They never STRIKE, take vacations or coffee breaks. They work overtime, all hours and days, on-call.

They waste less, are highly resourceful, and cannot steal from employers as it is their own money.

2 -FUNDING DAYCARE IS MORE EXPENSIVE, UNSUSTAINABLE, INEFFICIENT

- **over \$50 billion year** = true costs’ of truly ‘universal’ daycare based on available estimates and keeping regulations that assure “poor to mediocre” quality. Daycare lobbyists grossly understate costs.

- **Dollar costs** are rarely mentioned or grossly underestimated, and would certainly always be under pressure to increase: “*I don't have a dollar figure,*” says daycare advocate, Dr. Hillel Goelman (The Province). Yet there are many estimates, none of which consider 24/7/365, long-term, or sick-child care, or bureaucratic overhead:

*“1% of GDP”[18], about \$10.5 billion/year. This target was set in 1996 by the European Commission on Childcare and Other Measures to Reconcile Employment and Family Responsibilities. It was the MINIMUM and only for ages 0-5; daycare policy is for 0-12 or 16.

-Quebec alone already spends \$1.56 BILLION[19] and under 25% of children are in it[20].

*A RAND Corporation study of military centre-based care in the US of operating costs *excluding* capital costs, rent, and larger repairs, found the average annual costs per child were (US\$): \$15,217 for infants, \$11,827 for 2 year olds, and \$7,679 for school-age children. Regulatory and research costs were also excluded.[21]

* BC report 1999, operating costs “True Cost of Care”: \$1,217 month (\$14,604/yr) for infant/toddler care, \$8,592/yr for 3 to 5 year olds, \$3,816/yr for school-age children[22]

*Cleveland and Krashinski’s: \$8,500/yr per 2-5 yr olds, operating costs only.[23]

*The Head Start preschool program in the US received \$208.2 million from the federal government and served “over 49,000 children” (2002): over \$4,000 per child.[24]

Social & Economic Costs: the poor and worsening quality of daycare means that it is already adversely affecting HUMAN CAPITAL FORMATION and not improving it as promised. It means that EFFICIENT USE OF CAPITAL AND HUMAN RESOURCE INPUTS IS NOT ACHIEVED.

No “economies of scale” savings: such savings are actually not even claimed by daycare advocates. Looking after children in a way that maximizes and does not damage their outcomes IS and always will be “labour intensive” despite daycare economists Cleveland and Krashinski’s rejection of this fact. Children’s optimal development is dependent on attachment relationships and the PROCESS IS BIOLOGICAL and NOT amenable to INDUSTRIAL paradigms of efficiency.

Not Efficient: The HUMAN, PHYSICAL, and ENTREPRENEURIAL CAPITAL and inputs required per HOUR OF DAYCARE CARE are necessarily FAR above those required by the UNPAID CHILD CARE SECTOR WORKERS.

1 - HUMAN CAPITAL: Direct Care staff: needs of high quality daycare are such that it is not possible to be both “universal” and “high quality”. Daycare staffing problems are chronic, even in Sweden with its outrageous child:staff ratios.

Personnel Competition: with other sectors – NURSING, and other FEMALE DOMINATED sectors. NURSING in particular has been identified as an area needing very substantial INPUTS.

Regulatory staff: “STANGER CARE” requires the infusion of massive numbers of administrative, regulatory, inspection, research, lobbying, promotion and policy staff who never actually do child care just to attempt to ensure minimal standards and safety, and to screen out child molesters. The REGULATIONS are routinely violated, and provinces report not having enough “inspectors” to do the very infrequent inspections.

DUPLICATION: Parents monitor and regulate the care on a daily basis anyway.

Training Staff: Dr Gillian Doherty in *The Great Child Care Debate* says daycare workers require training to improve quality and parents do not because staff do not know the children and because of

non-sibling group dynamics.[25]

-Physical plant staff: to maintain, build and administer the daycare capital and the regulatory buildings: cleaners, janitors, gardeners, maintenance, builders, architects, engineers, etc.

2 - PHYSICAL CAPITAL

-Institutional care requires massive inputs of capital - capital which poorly duplicates the function of the 'learning environment' of the average home and the existing environment/capital – Libraries, shops, banks, parks, roadways, others homes, community centres, buses, etc.

Expensive, specialized and single-use: Capital inputs for care in daycares are more expensive than for care in homes because of the need: -to keep the public out

- for far more restrictive devices and specially designed equipment because of the safety concerns that directly result from the high number of children per staff.

Duplication of capital available universally in homes, libraries, parks, pools, community centres, etc.

Vacancies: the MAJORITY OF DAYCARE HAVE VACANCIES[26]. Most children in daycare are in the "spaces" PART-TIME. In summer especially, daycares are even emptier and need extra funding to compensate for loss of fee-revenue. The vast majority of child care takes place elsewhere.

3 - ENTREPRENEURIAL CAPITAL

Gov policy is artificially building and supporting this "*MARKET FAILURE*" (Cleveland & Krashinski) industry. Entrepreneurs are being drawn away from investing in G&S CONSUMERS WANT to daycare centres which consumers have consistently said and shown they don't want. This includes those who provide highly sought after high quality ELCC services such as music, dance, performance, specialized therapies and teachers, duolas, home-daycare, mother-baby drop-ins, fitness, etc.

Funding for daycare takes away from ENTREPRENEURIAL funding for other publicly supported G&S that CONSUMERS desire, especially nursing and medical training.

R & D for improved SOL of genuinely desirable G&S is severely constrained by the "brain drain" of HUMAN CAPITAL into the 'harm production and relief' sector. Entrepreneurial Capital is diverted to creating, studying, and dealing with the effects of junk food, advertising, lack of breast-feeding, addiction caused by lack of parent-child attachment's effects of brain development.

4 - NATURAL SOCIAL CAPITAL

Non-daycare care and learning is not only done by UNPAID parents but also by UNPAID grandparents, other SENIORS, friends, Scout Leaders, etc. It is also provided spontaneously by people like shop keepers and bus drivers who interact with children. This makes use of NATURAL SOCIAL CAPITAL of ATTACHMENT within families and communities. Use of this HUMAN and PHYSICAL (others homes and resources) CAPITAL both enriches and lowers the costs to parents of both parental and non-parental care. It also reduces costs of ill-health for seniors who are healthier because of doing this work. Unlike other "natural resources", use of this capital results in CAPITAL GROWTH, not depletion.

WHAT CONSUMERS WANT AND DON'T WANT

People want more time with family. Politician must heed the REFUSAL OF PARENTS AS CONSUMERS TO BUY INTO DAYCARE - despite the huge "opportunity costs" of parental care and governments' incentives for daycare and disincentives to parental care.

-Gov is risking exacerbating “tax revolt”.

-This is VERY **REGRESSIVE TAXATION** since daycare families are on average wealthier than other families. “**Low income**” and “**poverty**” are caused largely by parents sacrificing income in order to **have TIME with children**. Nearly 3 times as many high income families use daycare: only 5.8% of 2-parent families with incomes under \$40,000 compared to 16.5% with incomes of \$80,000 and over. Less than 20% of single-parent families used it. [27]

RECOMMENDATIONS

1- **abandon the GDP** as a measure of production and as a proxy measure for Standard of Living. Measure Standard of Living by self-reported “happiness” and “life satisfaction”.

2 – eliminate funding to daycare lobbyists/advocates: eg Child Care Resource & Research Unit

3- create an **Universal Child Benefit (UCB)** by transferring current expenditures on gov-registered daycare, early learning and development programmes, lobbyists, welfare to Families with Dependent Children (FDCs), CTB, NCB Supplement, NCB daycare expenditure, Early Childhood Development Agreement, Multilateral Framework on Early Learning and Child Care.

- UCB payments would be based on number of children 0-17, and take one of several forms:

NON-TAXABLE INCOME TESTED BENEFIT

Or REFUNDABLE TAX CREDIT

Or TAXABLE WITH IDENTICAL AMOUNTS REGARDLESS OF INCOME (as Family Allowance was)

AMOUNTS: range from a maximum AFTER TAX amount equivalent to replacing and increasing current welfare expenditures, to a minimum of not less than \$1200/yr /child age 0-18. This minimum is the 2004 equivalent of the \$20/month ‘family allowance’ of the 1970s EXCLUDING the tax deductions then provided.

CURRENT EXPENDITURES :

daycare costs over \$3.5 billion/yr for under 10% of children 0-12.

- prov expenditures on regulated child care 2003: \$2, 401,878,795[28]

-National Child Care Strategy: \$5 billion over 5 years

-municipal expenditures on regulated child care (include in kind provisions): ??

-Expenditures of Multilateral Framework of ELCC: \$1.05 billion over 5 years from 2003

-NCB amount spent on registered child care: ??

- Early Childhood Development Agreement: \$3.2 billion over 2001-2008

-Cost of Child Care Expense Deduction: ??

-federal expenditures on daycare:- in military: ??

- “ “ “ “ - First Nations reserves: ??

- “ -research, lobbying/advocacy, policy, consultations:??

-provincial expenditures on research, lobbying/advocacy, policy, consultations: ??

-other public expenditures on daycare (eg. Universities): ??

EXPENDITURES ON DIRECT SUPPORT TO FAMILIES

-Child Tax Benefit and NCB Supplement expenditures: \$7.7 billion in 2001-provincial expenditures of – provincial welfare and related administration for families with children:?

4 - **DISALLOW BENEFITS** except for dependent children and their parents who are not ‘covered’ by their employers. Disallow “marriage” and sexual relationships as the qualifier for these benefits: anyone with benefits could ‘sponser’ any ‘uncovered’ care-giver and/or anyone’s ‘uncovered’ dependent

children. This would help create a very meaningful “adoptive” role for non-parents and would reduce the punitive financial and health impacts of single-parenthood on mothers and their children.

5 - CHARITABLE GIVINGS: allow charitable status for gifts to Low Income (LICO) families to recognize and encourage this practice, to lower incidence of Low Income and gov’t expenditure. This puts families on an equal footing with other child-related charities such as daycares and pre-schools.

6 - PARENT EMPOWERMENT INFO CAMPAIGNS based on DEVELOPMENTAL SCIENCE

7- Increase child support guideline amounts, and include costs to parent of providing parental care

ANTICIPATED SAVINGS & RESULTS: INCREASED STANDARD OF LIVING

CHILD CARE – savings in costs of administrative, regulatory, bureaucracy, monitoring, research, lobbying, training

SOCIAL & HEALTH- reductions in costs and incidence of crime, suicide, addiction, illness, in-home medical care

INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY & EFFICIENCY

- in child care sector
- in unpaid formal and informal volunteer/civic society sectors
- in **other care and educ** sectors: as UNPAID CC workers take on more work, school, care-giving (elder, dying and sick, handicapped)

IMPROVED ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY & LIVABILITY

- reduction of car-commute to work – reduction of traffic and green house gases
- reduction of garbage due to higher use of heavily packaged convenience foods
- increase use of re-usable cloth diapers over single-use diapers
- reduction of energy and materials needed for formula feeding as BREAST-FEEDING becomes more viable and recognized
- increase practice of “reduce, re-use, recycle” and composting as one of the MULTIPLE TASKS of unpaid care workers
- increase practice of home-gardening and labour intensive low-pesticide techniques

REDUCED INCIDENCE OF LOW INCOME and CIRCULATION OF MONEY IN THE ECONOMY

INCREASED VIABILITY OF UNPAID SECTOR

- potentially increases birthrate by increasing respect and viability of sector

ENTREPRENEURIAL EXPANSION as families will use the money in many ways including building their own businesses, especially in-home businesses.

NOTES

1-*Workforce participation of mothers by age of youngest child—2003* http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2004/tables_big/TABLE6.pdf
- Definitions used in Statistics Canada’s work data: <http://www.statcan.ca/english/freepub/71-222-XIE/2004000/glossary.htm>

2Canadian Policy Research Network Press Release: “Values and Preferences for the ‘Best Policy Mix’ for Canadian Children”

3ELCC Agreements in Principle http://www.sdc.gc.ca/en/cs/comm/sd/news/agreements_principle/index.shtml

4 M. Tresch Owen presentation Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development June 2005 Regina “Child Care Quality: How & Why it Matters for Children’s Development” http://www.excellence-earlychildhood.ca/documents/Margaret_Tresch_Owen_ANG.pdf p34.

- “Results of NICHD Study of Early Child Care Reported at Society for Research in Child Development Meeting” NICHD April 3 1997
<http://www.nichd.nih.gov/new/releases/rel4top.cfm>
- 5 National Institute of Child Health and Human Development “Child Care Linked to Assertive, Noncompliant, and Aggressive Behaviors”
 July 16 2003 http://www.nichd.nih.gov/new/releases/child_care.cfm
- 6 US National Institute of Child Health and Human Development in *Globe and Mail* July 19, 2004
- 7 ScienCentral News “Wild Young Brains” Nov 11 2003
www.sciencentral.com/articles/view.php3?language=english&type=&article_id=218392104
- 8 ScienCentral News “Maternal Separation” Nov 11 2003
www.sciencentral.com/articles/view.php3?language=english&type=&article_id=218391871
 -ScienCentral News “SIDS Signal” Jan 7 2005 www.sciencentral.com/articles/view.php3?article_id=218392452...
- 9 *You Bet I Care!* 2 p. ix-x http://action.web.ca/home/cfwwb/attach/ybic_report_2.pdf
- 10 Gillian Doherty presentation “Quality & Predictors of Quality in Canadian Child Care” Centre for Excellence for Early Childhood Development, Regina June 2005 http://www.excellence-earlychildhood.ca/documents/Gillian_Doherty_ANG.pdf p.4
- 11 Daycare child:staff ratios & ‘Quality’: Bad & Getting Worse” <http://www.kidsfirstcanada.org/blog-vol3.htm>
 -ECEC 2004 <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pt98/pdf/big.pdf> CHART 15
 -ECEC 2001 http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2001/tables_big/TABLE22.pdf
- 12 ***Pre-School in Transition: A national evaluation of the Swedish pre-school***
[http://www.skolverket.se/sb/d/193/url/0068007400740070003a002f002f007700770034002e0073006b006f006c007600650072006b00650074002e00730065002f00420041005300490053002f0073006b006f006c0062006f006b002f007700650062006500780074002f0074007200790063006b00730061006b002f004400440057003f0057003d004b00450059003d0031003300370038/target/DDW%3FW%3DKEY%3D1378](http://www.skolverket.se/sb/d/193/url/0068007400740070003a002f002f0077007700770034002e0073006b006f006c007600650072006b00650074002e00730065002f00420041005300490053002f0073006b006f006c0062006f006b002f007700650062006500780074002f0074007200790063006b00730061006b002f004400440057003f0057003d004b00450059003d0031003300370038/target/DDW%3FW%3DKEY%3D1378)
- 13 *Women in England 1870-1950*, Jane Lewis p.x and 146, quoted in *The Politics of Breastfeeding* p178-79.
- 14 “*The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care: the Economic Rationale for Investment in Young Children*” (p 73-74).
- 15 NCB expenditure <http://www.nationalchildbenefit.ca/ncb/govtofcan1.shtml>
- 16 2001 Census: Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 95-224-xPB p 16
- 17 New York stock broker quoted in *The Corporation* by UBC Law Professor Joel Bakan
- 18 Helen Penn “A Framework for Quality: A European Perspective” European Commission on Childcare and Other Measures to Reconcile Employment and Family Responsibilities <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/fs/fs6.pdf>
 “Values and Beliefs in Caring for Babies and Toddlers” <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/fs/fs7.pdf>
- 19-ECEC 2004 http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2004/tables_long/TABLE28.pdf
- 20-Jocelyn Tougas, *Reforming Quebec’s Early Childhood Care and Education: the First Five Years*, p. 74
<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op17/op17ENG.pdf>
- 21 RAND Foundation <http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1415/MR1415.chap4.pdf>
- 22 BC Gov’t discussion paper: *Building a Better Future for BC’s Kids*, p.4, 1999
- 23 *The Benefits & Costs of Good Child Care* Cleveland & Krashinski <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/other/benefits/bc.pdf> p56
- 24 NY Times July 7, 2003
- 25*The Great Child Care Debate*, Gillian Doherty
www.childcarecanada.org/resources/CRRUpubs/op7/7op7.html
- 26 *You Bet I Care!* – 1, 2000, pp. 163-166 http://action.web.ca/home/cfwwb/attach/ybic_report_1.pdf
- 27 Dr. Francis Woolley, “Taxing Canadian Families” *Policy Options* www.irpp.org/choices/archive/vol6no5.pdf
- 28 *Early Childhood Education and Care 2004*, Childcare Resource and Research Unit www.childcarecanada.org