

SUBMISSION TO THE

SOCIAL POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE ONTARIO GOVERNMENT

REGARDING BILL 242 An Act to amend the Education Act and certain other
Acts in relation to early childhood educators, junior kindergarten and
kindergarten, extended day programs and certain other matters

by

KIDS FIRST PARENT ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

www.kidsfirstcanada.org

MARCH 2010

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY-----	3
I - Lack of evidence supporting this policy as claimed in the Bill-----	4
A - Mis-representation and falsification of peer-reviewed research in Dr. Pascal’s report <i>With Our Best Future in Mind</i> and in his compendium of evidence	
1-Dr James Heckman, Nobel laureate in economics opposes such policies	
2-US National Institute for Child Health and Human Development Child Care Study falsely used to support this policy-----	5
3-Quebec study by Milligan, Baker, Gruber falsely used to support this policy-----	8
4-over 25% “vulnerable” according to Early Development Index: only 5% according to Offord Centre EDI inventors-----	8
5-Quebec study by Merrigan, Lefebvre falsely used to support this policy-----	9
6-Canadian all day JK study evidence falsely used to support this policy-----	10
B - Reliance on non-peer-reviewed, non-empirical, deeply flawed, sexist, ideologically biased, discredited research-----	11
1 – International assessments	
a -“Unicef” report’s low ranking of Canada is not backed by Unicef; based on biased ideologically based “benchmarks”; daycare lobby authorship; Canadian daycare lobby involvement in report-----	12
b - OECD child & family policy in Canada: bias described by daycare lobby; Canada’s low ranking - inaccurate assessment of ECEC expenditure; propaganda function of “ranking” and reports documented; cover-up of those ties; bias and cover up of bias; close ties to Canada’s daycare lobby and cover up of those ties -----	13
3 -Ypsilanti, Michigan Perry Preschool Project-----	17
II - Evidence of lasting harms and no lasting benefit resulting for similar policies	
1-Sweden: academics, youth violence, illness, quality of childrens care, women’s equality, taxation---	19
2 -France – social cohesion-----	21
3-Quebec – child and family outcomes, equity	
4 -California – quality-----	22
5 -Oklahoma, Georgia, Tennessee - academics	
6-Canada - Human Early Learning Partnership (HELP)-----	23
7 -Breastfeeding	
III - False assumptions based on mis-leading use of data	
1 - shortage of daycare spaces? – waitlists are not reliable measure of demand	
2 - high vacancy rates as measure of low demand for daycare spaces-----	24
3 – parental preference as measure of demand for daycare spaces-----	25
4 – low use of daycare centres and covered up by Statistics Canada	
5 – daycare centre use is much higher than genuine demand	
6 – parents/mothers “working”? – mis-representation and mis-use of mothers’ Labour Force Participation rate data	

7 - inconvenience to majority parents in transporting children: does not fit the facts-----26
8 – polls do not show support for this proposal

IV - Evidence of benefits from later not earlier school entry age-----27

- Finland
- RAND Corporation study
- EDI

V – ideological basis of this policy as shown in policy formation papers

1 – OECD and “Integration”-----28

2 - European Commission Network on Childcare: rejecting empirical evidence and attachment theory---30

3 – World Bank: funding, Canadian ECEC policy makers consulting with the World Bank, Bank thinking,
not about women’s equality-----31



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Kids First Parent Association of Canada is a national grass-roots, volunteer-run, registered charity concerned with children's well-being and care. Founded in 1987, we receive no funding from government, unions, or business. We are part of an international movement working for an end to governments' discrimination against parental child care, against parents who prioritise doing this work, and against our children.

This Bill contemplates public funding for programs of up to 11 hours a day, 52 weeks year for children as young as 3, and as young as 0 if Dr Pascal's proposal found in his report, With Our Best Future in Mind, is fully accepted. In short this Bill would coerce the public into funding a massive expansion of the institutional care of children.

The Preamble to this Bill states: "Academic research has established the benefits of a comprehensive, full day early learning program. Full day early learning improves outcomes for individual children and for society." Firstly, it is obvious that 'early learning and care' are beneficial: children die without care and begin to learn before birth. But this statement is dangerously vague. How are these key terms defined: 'academic research', 'full day', 'early learning', 'program', and 'improved outcomes'?

The system contemplated in this policy has not been shown to produce 'benefits' or improve outcomes as stated in the Preamble This submission is intended to demonstrate that this Preamble statement - which underlies the entire rationale for this Bill - is false, and that in fact the opposite is true, that is, that the reliable research shows that this policy would cause harms and not benefits to children and society. This submission provides evidence from the sources of 'academic research' purported to support this statement found in Dr Pascal's report, With Our Best Future in Mind and his related compendium of evidence, as well as other sources.

In addition, this submission exposes some of the ample evidence of an underlying ideological agenda behind this policy and the broader "integration" agenda. This ideology seeks to replace what is called "the ideology of the family" (OECD). It lacks public support. This ideological agenda is covered-up in carefully crafted 'spin' and a campaign of dis-information. We are told this policy is about: gender equity for women, play-based learning, children's rights, work-life balance, poverty reduction, and fantastical 'investment' returns of up to over \$17 for every dollar spent.

But the bare fact remains that this policy is about further reducing the amount of time parents and children spend together. That is not good for children, women, families, or society. It violates UN and Charter rights.

The mis-representation and falsification of evidence used to support this policy is either deliberate deception – fraud – or failure to do due diligence and/or gross incompetence.

Therefore we recommend that the Government of Ontario:

- place an immediate moratorium on all action implementing this policy
- replace this policy with direct and equitable funding for parents, perhaps as a 'Kindergarten Credit'
- conduct a formal investigation/hearing into production of the evidence underlying this Bill
- hold those responsible for the fraud and/or incompetence and/or negligence regarding 'evidence' personally legally accountable
- publicly correct the mis-information this Bill is based on
- take legal action against them including a public apology
- provide restitution for costs and harm done by this discriminatory policy to those children and parents effected

I - Lack of evidence supporting this policy as claimed in the Bill

The evidence used to support this policy in the report and related evidence compendium written by Dr Charles Pascal for the Ontario government mixes many opinion pieces by ideologically based organizations and individuals with a few solid peer-reviewed empirical evidence papers published in reliable scholarly journals. The solid evidence Pascal cites does not support the policy, though Pascal misrepresents it grossly to say it does. The many other articles he cites are not credible because of their lack of empirical evidence and peer-review, and/or failure to define of key terms such as “care” and “learning,” to say nothing of their ideological bias, sexism, pecuniary interest in this policy, and false and mis-leading statements.

A - Mis-representation and falsification of peer-reviewed research in Dr. Pascal’s report ‘With Our Best Future in Mind’ and in his compendium of evidence

Actually reading the research Pascal cites repeatedly reveals that he takes as key “evidence” research that does not support this policy and grossly mis-represents it and uses it as support.

1- Dr James Heckman, Nobel laureate in economics opposes such policies

PASCAL REPORT ON HECKMAN: *“Nobel laureate economist James Heckman... calculates a 7:1 return on public investments for programs for young children compared to a 1:1 payback for adult education.”* pp10-12

In fact Heckman does not recommend “universal” systems like Pascal’s. His findings are for very under-privileged children with additional problems in very intensive targeted programs intensely involving the mothers. Rather than all-day kindergarten and more daycare funding, Heckman in fact recommends “respect” for parents, and “informed choice”. For families that are very marginalized/under-privileged he seeks **targeted cash vouchers** to use in faith and community organizations.

HECKMAN:

“None of this evidence supports universal preschool programs.”

“The solid evidence for the effectiveness of early interventions is limited to those conducted on disadvantaged populations”

“Advocates and supporters of universal preschool often use existing research for purely political purposes.”

“People are very worried about the central government inculcating values in their children that they don't agree with.”

He hopes *“that early childhood provision doesn't come to resemble a government bureaucracy,”* which is exactly what the proposed program is.

“I have great respect for advocates for early childhood, but they have a tendency to think their case is 100 percent solid when it’s not. Often, I think legislators are smart enough to know there’s more disagreement than the advocates say”

“The need for more experimentation is another argument for *vouchers*, by the way, for *private sector diversity and choice*. I worry that if Obama, or anybody else, commits too much time and investment into any one programme at this stage, we’ll lose the opportunity to go forward and learn more. The best programme is almost certainly one that hasn’t been tried yet.” [emphases added]

* “Protect Our Kids from Preschool” by SHIKHA DALMIA and LISA SNELL

August 22, 2008 Wall Street Journal

http://online.wsj.com/public/article_print/SB121936615766562189.html

* p 35 of The Productivity Argument for Investing in Young Children

<http://jenni.uchicago.edu/Invest/>

* “Interview with James Heckman” pp24-29

http://www.bernardvanleer.org/publication_store/publication_store_publications/family_stress_safeguarding_young_childrens_care_environment/file

2 -US National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Child Care Study falsely used to support this policy

PASCAL (EVIDENCE PAPER) ON NICHD STUDY: “*Early childhood programs that offer full-year, full-time options support the ability of parents to earn a living without compromising children’s early experiences (... NICHD – Early Child Care Research Network 2004a, 2004b;...”* p32

The US NICHD Child Care study is the most rigorously designed, peer-reviewed, expensive, study ever of the children in “child care”: it defines “child care” as non-maternal care of any type over 10 hrs/wk. The most recent published phase is up to grade 6. Pascal had available to him but chose not to cite their findings from this latest research published in 2007. NICHD publications do not say what Pascal says they say.

Unlike daycare lobby propaganda, complete NICHD study papers are not available on line. To obtain them: CONTACT LEAD RESEARCHER:

Jay Belsky, Director

Institute for the Study of Children, Families and Social Issues

Birkbeck University of London

7 Bedford Square

London EC1M 5UG

Mobile: 07507640064

Office: 0207 079 0835

Fax: 0207 323 4735

NICHD CHILD CARE STUDY (“child care” = any type of non-maternal care, over 10 hours/week)

-“child care” decreases maternal sensitivity

-maternal sensitivity is the #1 predictor of child outcomes.

-more use of “child care” predicts increased behavioural problems (cruelty, aggression, non-compliance, etc) REGARDLESS OF QUALITY. By grade 6 these effects fade EXCEPT for DAYCARE CENTRE care.

-longer hours in DAYCARE CENTRES , REGARDLESS OF QUALITY, predicts high incidence of behavioural problems that do not diminish by grade 6

-“high quality” “child care” of all types is associated with some cognitive advantage. Some of these fade and some persist (eg memory) to grade 6

- “more hours spent in child care across the first 4.5 years of life increased children’s probability of scoring in the “at-risk” range of externalizing problems just before and soon after school entry, according to teacher and parent reports (NICHD ECCRN, 2003).”

* 2009 “EFFECTS OF CHILD CARE ON CHILD DEVELOPMENT:GIVE PARENTS REAL CHOICE”
http://www.mpsv.cz/files/clanky/6640/9_Jay_Belsky_EN.pdf

* 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

* Child Care and Behavior, Findings from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development's Study of Child Care and Youth Development, Harvard Graduate School of Education, July 16, 2003

<http://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/features/mccartney07162003.html>

* “The effects of infant child care on infant-mother attachment security: Results of the NICHD Study of Early Child Care.” Child Development, 68 <http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=9>

“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>

* Interview - Child Care and Behavior Findings from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development's Study of Child Care and Youth Development

<http://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/features/mccartney07162003.html>

* Are there long-term effects of early child care?. Child Development, 78 (2). Belsky, Vandell, Burchinal, Clarke-Stewart, McCartney, Owen, and the NICHD ECCRN. (2007).

<https://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=87>

NICHD ON EFFECT OF AGE OF KINDERGARTEN ENTRY

“children who entered kindergarten at younger ages had higher (estimated) scores in kindergarten on the Woodcock-Johnson (W-J) Letter-Word Recognition subtest but received lower ratings from kindergarten teachers with respect to Language and Literacy and Mathematical Thinking. Further, children who entered kindergarten at older ages evinced greater increase over time on four W-J subtests (i.e., Letter-Word Recognition, Applied-Problems, Memory for Sentences, Picture Vocabulary subtests) and outperformed children who started kindergarten at younger ages on two W-J subtests in third grade (i.e., Applied Problems, Picture Vocabulary). Age of entry proved unrelated to socioemotional functioning.”

* NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2007). Age of entry to kindergarten and children's academic and socioemotional development. Early Education & Development, 18 (2).

<https://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=76>

STUDIES USING NICHD DATABASE:

“The highest level of positive caregiving was provided by in home caregivers, including fathers and grandparents, caring for only 1 child, closely followed by home based arrangements with relatively few children per adult. The least positive caregiving was found in center based care with higher ratios of children to adults.”

“Contrary to expectations, limited evidence was found to suggest child care experiences moderate the negative associations between family risk and child outcomes.”

“Thus, the argument that child-care quality affects child outcomes was only partially supported by this investigation.”

* Does quality of child care affect child outcomes at age 4 ½?. Developmental Psychology, 39.

<http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=40>

* The interaction of child care and family risk in relation to child development at 24 and 36 months. Applied Developmental Science, 6. <http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=28>

* Characteristics and quality of child care for toddlers and preschoolers. Applied Developmental Science, 4. <http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=17>

Dr Jay Belsky is lead researcher on the NICHD and UK studies and consultant to UK PM Brown:

DR JAY BELSKY: *“Professor Belsky, the director of the Institute for the Study of Children, Families and Social Issues at Birkbeck College in London, said that both US and British research points in the same direction.*

””The risks are that more hours in any kind of childcare across the first four-and-a-half years of life and, independently, the more time in childcare centres, the higher the levels of problem behaviour,” he added.”

“There is also evidence “that children who spend more time in non-maternal care through their infancy, toddler and pre-school years experience somewhat less harmonious mother-child relationships through their first three years”.

He said they “start school being somewhat more aggressive and disobedient than children with less non-maternal care experience”.”

“These “disconcerting” effects can not be blamed on poor-quality childcare - and “seem more likely and longlasting when children experience centrebased care early in life”.”

“Professor Belsky said that although family background has a bigger influence on development, “more and more children seem to be spending more and more time and younger and younger ages in nonmaternal care arrangements in the English-speaking world”. “

“He added: “This means that small effects, when experienced by many children, may have broad- scale consequences.” “

“He called for policies to help reduce time spent in childcare, in particular “centre-based care” - and to give a parent the opportunity to stay at home if they so wish. “

””Tax policies should support families rearing infants and young children in ways that afford parents the freedom to make child-rearing arrangements that they deem best for their child,” he added. “

“The system should “reduce the economic coercion that necessitates many, at least in the U.S.A and the UK, to leave the care of their children to others when they would rather not”. “

* “Brown advisor calls for tax breaks for stay-at-home mums after warning over nurseries” London Evening Standard 2008 <http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/news/article-23430539-brown-advisor-calls-for-tax-breaks-for-stay-at-home-mums-after-warning-over-nurseries.do>

"...the value I am inclined to champion is that of choice. So rather than implement policies that promote certain choices, be they to enable mothers (or fathers) to remain at home caring for their youngest children, as surveys indicate parents want to do (and as children surely want them to do), or to enable them to enter the workforce and rely on child care, I would encourage policymakers to offer families real choice. Payments made directly to families with children would seem to be an excellent way of enabling parents to exercise true freedom of choice. They could use the money to supplement family income should mother (or father) choose not to seek paid employment. Or the same money could be used to purchase child care should both parents (or the single parent) seek paid employment."

* Jay Belsky, "EFFECTS OF CHILD CARE ON CHILD DEVELOPMENT: GIVE PARENTS REAL CHOICE" http://www.mpsv.cz/files/clanky/6640/9_Jay_Belsky_EN.pdf

3 -Quebec study by Milligan, Baker, Gruber falsely used to support this policy.

PASCAL EVIDENCE PAPER USE OF MILLIGAN et al STUDY OF QUEBEC DAYCARE: *"Early childhood programs that offer full-year, full-time options support the ability of parents to earn a living without compromising children's early experiences (Baker, Gruber, & Milligan, 2005..." (p 32)*

Pascal references this paper in its 2005 pre-peer reviewed form. This paper was published in the prestigious Journal of Political Economy and won the 2008 Purvis Prize in Canadian economics. It did not find what Pascal reports.

BAKER, MILLIGAN, GRUBER:

"We uncover striking evidence that children are worse off in a variety of behavioral and health dimensions, ranging from aggression to motor-social skills to illness. Our analysis also suggests that the new childcare program led to more hostile, less consistent parenting, worse parental health, and lower-quality parental relationships."

"The consistency of the results suggests that more access to childcare is bad for these children."

* "Universal childcare, maternal labor supply, and family well-being" *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 116, No. 4, (August 2008)

4 - over 25% "vulnerable" according to Early Development Index: only 5% according to Offord Centre EDI inventors

PASCAL REPORT ON SCHOOL READINESS/VULNERABILITY: *"More than one in four children enter Grade 1 significantly behind their peers [1]"*

"1 Assessments indicate that 27 per cent of children in Ontario (and a similar percentage across Canada) are vulnerable when they enter Grade 1 – they have learning, health, and behaviour problems that are likely to interfere with their academic achievement and ability to get along with others."

'School readiness to learn' also called "vulnerability" here is determined by the Early Development Index (EDI) data. The EDI was designed and is conducted by the Offord Centre at McMaster University. Their website say only 5% not 25+%.

OFFORD CENTRE, McMASTER UNIVERSITY:

"1 in 20 children enter kindergarten without the skills they need to learn."

* School Readiness to Learn Project Offord Centre, McMaster Univ
<http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/>

5 - Quebec study by Merrigan, Lefebvre falsely used to support this policy

PASCAL REPORT: *"Over 40 per cent of the public cost of Quebec's early childhood program is covered by the tax revenues from mothers who otherwise would not be working if low-cost child care was not available.¹⁵"*

15 Lefebvre, P., & Merrigan, P. (2008). Childcare policy and the labor supply of mothers: A natural experiment for Canada. Journal of Labor Economics, 26 (3), 519–548.

That only 40% of the operating costs of this program are not covered by increased tax revenue should not be considered a selling point.

These economists are critical of the Quebec program for its high and rising cost including wages raises and pensions for staff; negative impact on choice and equity, and negative impact on the majority of families' finances.

MERRIGAN AND LEFEBVRE:

"The monetary allotments used to support this policy appear therefore to be relatively high if their only advantage is to increase labor supply. A large wedge has been created between what is actually paid for by the parents (since January 2004, \$7 per day) and the actual cost of day care (closer to \$40 per day). This pricing policy coupled with the necessity of utilizing these services five days per week creates strong distortions related to the optimal choice of day care services."

"The dynamics of the regime imposed by the government²⁹ have basically negated other types of policy interventions to support families with young children. For example, if families had a choice between a day care subsidy and a lump-sum amount of the same value (a policy pursued in Norway and Denmark for children aged less than 3 years), several families with children under three years of age would probably choose the lump sum.³⁰ However, given that this would generate job losses in the publicly funded system, unions could react strongly to such a policy and disrupt services."

"The creation of more low-fee spaces ...raises the question of the "efficiency" of the policy to induce more mothers to join the labor force and work full-time who otherwise would choose other modes of work (e.g. part-time) and child care for their young children."

"... a rather large proportion of families (36%) pay more than \$5/day either because they cannot find a space (in the subsidized network) or by choice, and 8% use "free" day care (by relatives or subsidized childcare with a fee waiver). In both cases, government subsidies are much larger for parents using the \$5 per day services generating some inequities across families."

"Furthermore, families with young children who choose to care for their children themselves or do not use nonparental child care, even though they are employed part-time or full-time (parents who coordinate their shifts to provide exclusively parental care), are not treated equally in terms of public family support. The value of the subsidies attached to in-kind child care is not matched by the other forms of family

support for families caring for and educating their children or using other types of childcare ,such as part time or full-time home-based care.”

“ There is also a “one size fits all issue”. The Québec model... is “one-dimensional,” in the sense that it serves well the needs of parents working full-time, five days a week with a rather standard – 8a.m. /9a.m. to 4p.m./5p.m. – working schedule. Parents working part-time or with non-standard hours and those with intermittent employment are excluded from the system.”

“ the government, with this policy has moved the child care industry towards a more monopolistic type of market. Unions reacted to this policy by organizing labor particularly in day care centers. The bargaining power of the day care workers is very strong as strikes can be very costly to parents and therefore for the governments in power who can see their popularity erode quite quickly if the strike is prolonged. On the other hand, they can also see their popularity fade if they give in to unions and finance the higher wages to day care workers with higher fees for daily services.”

“This new bargaining power is partly responsible for the large increase (100%) in daily subsidies per space since 1998 onwards. Subsidies now cover costs for unemployment insurance, pension funds and other non pecuniary benefits. Second, the government is now closely scrutinized with respect to the quality of day care. .. This is putting more pressure on the government to increase the quality of care by hiring better trained personnel which also is much more costly to attract.”

“...Discussions surrounding issues of horizontal and vertical equity should be considered for a thorough analysis of the policy.”

* ”Low-fee (\$5/day/child) Regulated Childcare Policy and the Labor Supply of Mothers with Young Children: a Natural Experiment from Canada” 2005, Centre interuniversitaire sur le risque, les politiques économiques et l’emploi pp 23-26 <http://132.203.59.18/CIRPEE/cahierscirpee/2005/files/CIRPEE05-08.pdf>

6 - Canadian all day JK study evidence mis-used to support this policy

PASCAL REPORT ON EVIDENCE OF BETTER OUTCOME FOR ALL DAY OVER HALF DAY:
“Results from Canadian studies concur with US research: full day preschool programs promote children’s successful; transition to formal schooling. Children attending Full day programs had better academic performance and social success as they entered grade one than children who attended half day programs”

Pascal lists three studies in his note. Two are non-peer reviewed presentations at US education conferences. The other is a study of half vs full day Ontario French preschool at age 4. It found those in preschool half or full day were far below those with no preschool. It found behavioural problems for all-day children. The assessment was not of long-term effects as it was done just one year later in Kindergarten.

STUDY OF ALL DAY VS HALF DAY JK IN ONTARIO: What Pascal left out in discussing this study:

“... children who attended the preschool program for 4-year-olds still score below the pan-Canadian average for vocabulary development.... Indeed, children attending the program on a half-day basis obtained a percentile ranking of 28 compared to children who attended the program on a full-day basis who scored, on average, 35 on a percentile range. Both of these fall below the mean percentile score of 50.”

“Teachers even noted an increase in behaviors linked to hyperactivity and lack of attention as well as a decrease in academic behaviors such as “Being attentive in class” and “Listening carefully to instructions” ... These two results could be explained by a higher level of fatigue among children who attended the full-day program for 4-year-olds.”

“... the children in the full-day program were tired at the end of their day in class. These results are surprising as prior studies had unanimously claimed that preschool programs facilitated social adjustment...”

“...there was a diminishment in the motor development of children who attended the full-day program as compared to those in the half-day program.” (emphasis added)

* “Effects of a Full-Day Preschool Program on 4-Year-Old Children”

<http://www.ecrp.uiuc.edu/v9n2/herry.html>

B - Reliance on non-peer-reviewed, non-empirical, deeply flawed, sexist, ideologically biased and inaccurate opinions

1 - Canada’s low ranking in “international assessments” is inaccurate and biased.

The OECD and the Innocenti Centre do not produce objective empirical peer-reviewed scholarly evidence supporting this policy. The daycare activists working on these “assessments” are closely tied and often the very same people.

PASCAL REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL ASSESSMENTS: *“The following table shows that Canada consistently scores low on international assessments of early learning and care.” (p4)*

Number of Benchmarks for Early Learning and Care
Met by Country (UNICEF)²

Sweden 10
Iceland 9
Denmark 8
Norway 7
France 6
UK 5
Germany 4
Japan 3
United States 2
Canada 1

2 UNICEF. (2008). The Child Care Transition, Innocenti Report Card 8, 2008. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.

A closer look at these supposedly objective “international assessments” by the OECD and purportedly by Unicef shows they are not objective assessments, but are tools invented to “shame” nations into ideologically

preferred policies. They are created by leaders of the Canadian daycare lobby working with its international network. They are full of inaccuracies and propaganda.

a- “Unicef” assessment

The “Unicef report”: “The child care transition, Innocenti Report Card 8,” which is called the Unicef report, actually comes from the Innocenti Centre which is affiliated with the OECD and Unicef. The report emphasizes OECD and World Bank objectives for child policy: jobs for mothers, daycare for children.

Unicef itself takes no responsibility for report contents.

UNICEF:

“The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the policy or views of UNICEF.”

“The [Innocenti] Centre’s publications are contributions to a global debate on child rights issues and include a wide range of opinions. For that reason, the Centre may produce publications that do not necessarily reflect UNICEF policies or approaches on some topics.”

The report does not so much objectively describe as it acts a propaganda weapon/policy tool to advance the so-called “Child care Transition.”

Canada ranks low on the “bench marks” because they benchmarks are ideologically biased in several ways:

-the “benchmarks” reflect the agenda of daycare lobbyists (see below) including the World Bank, not research by objective “academic experts” as the report calls them, or the democratically expressed will of Canadian citizens’ and parents, or of elected publicly accountable politicians:

“this Report Card advances the idea of an internationally applicable set of benchmarks suggested, drawn up in consultation with government officials and academic experts from OECD countries in Asia, Europe, and North America, with additional input from both UNICEF and the World Bank...” (p7)

- because the author excluded all other forms of care and learning from consideration and few Canadian children are in institutional care/learning settings. Only 14.9% of Canadian children age 6 months to 5 years are on daycare centers. In Ontario Statistics Canada-based data shows 11.21%.

* "Child Care in Canada" 2006 Table 25 p 97 <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-599-m/89-599-m2006003-eng.pdf>

* <http://www.kidsfirstcanada.org/chart-daycare-use.htm>

“The benchmarks...take no account of other significant services” and only “relate...to out-of-home, centre-based child care.”

- because the author also excluded child-related public funding for anything but licensed centres. All such expenditures by parents/families themselves are also excluded.

Not counted: music lessons, swim classes, family daycare, camping trips, play dates, Sunday school, parent-child drop-ins, library visits, La Leche League gatherings, playground excursions, Saturday Chinese school, nature walks, bringing grandparents from Europe for a year here, nannies, etc.

The OECD, the World Bank and apparently the Innocenti Centre take it as an undisputed ‘good’ that children are in daycare centers, but this consensus does not reflect Canadian reality or aspirations. 9 out of 10 parents surveyed by the Vanier Institute for the Family said they preferred one parent to look after pre-school children; those who did not prefer this option still chose a parent as their #1 choice of care-provider, ranking daycare centres #5.

* http://www.vifamily.ca/library/future/future_toc.html section 5 and section 8

- because of the measure of “child poverty” used:

“Specifically, a child poverty rate of less than 10 per cent. The definition of child poverty is that used by the OECD – the percentage of children growing up in families in which income, adjusted for family size, is less than 50 per cent of median income.” (p14)

Canadian children are materially wealthier than perhaps all others, but this measure does not reflect that.

Daycare lobby authorship:

The sole author, Peter Adamson, is the founder of the New Internationalist magazine,

* “A splendid torch Peter Adamson pays tribute to the inspirational life of Jim Grant, the former Executive Director of UNICEF” <http://www.newint.org/issue266/endpiece.htm>

It was *“supported by two background papers commissioned by the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre and written by John Bennett.” (p.36)*

Bennett also headed the OECD’s Canadian child care report.

Canadian daycare lobby leaders involvement in Innocenti Report

The help of “academic experts” and “government officials” is also mentioned. These are not randomly selected. We learned there were two from Canada:

-**Martha Friendly**, long time daycare advocate and head of the CRRU. Her well-known name is not listed. It was supplied by Unicef on request. She wrote a number of media commentaries on the report that did not disclose her participation. Friendly also co-authored the OECD’s “Background Report” for the survey conducted by Bennett. However, in letters in the National Post, both she and Bennett publicly denied her participation in the OECD’s reports.

-The other unnamed Canadian “academic” and “government official” is **Sandra Griffin**, founding president and former Executive Director of the Canadian Childcare Federation, a leading daycare lobby group. She was BC’s Director of Child Care Policy http://www.cccns.org/pdf/journal_oct99.pdf and is currently Assistant Deputy Minister of the Ministry of Children and Family Development and Minister Responsible for Child Care.

<http://dir.gov.bc.ca/gtds.cgi?show=Branch&organizationCode=CFD&organizationalUnitCode=XEE>

b - OECD child & family policy in Canada:

CHILDCARE RESOURCE & RESEARCH UNIT PAPER DESCRIBES THE OECD’S ECEC UNIT’S BIAS:

“Thus in the case of NPM (New Public Management) ‘they present a reform agenda...help to define economic and social reality, not just measure what already exists.’ ”

The OECD's ECEC Unit : "Its potential strength comes from the way it structured the review process. It carried out its work in such a way as to draw in and develop a transnational network of early childhood specialists and advocates. It thus blurred the boundary between epistemic communities, made up of experts linked by cognitive and professional ties (Haas, 1992), and transnational advocacy networks – "networks of activists, distinguishable largely by the centrality of principled ideas or values in motivating their formation" (Keck and Sikkink, 1999: 89). In this it has built on, and extended, the earlier work of the European Commission's Childcare Network. Just as the latter forged links among child care advocates operating at different scales – local and national – adding the European, the ECEC branch has done the same across the OECD. Its success, of course, will depend on the capacity of advocates to make good use of these reports in their struggles"

*"The OECD and the Reconciliation Agenda: Competing Blueprints," R. Mahon
<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op20/op20.pdf> p9

The OECD's low ranking of Canada's ECEC expenditure: a 'big lie'

Another one of the "assessments" Pascal is likely referring to but has the sense not to mention is the widely publicized "dead last" (14th) ranking of Canada by the OECD itself. Its ranking of nations' spending made front page news and led to Senate hearings. Following 'big lie' strategy, it continues to be routinely cited even now by daycare/all-day Kindergarten promoters

OECD ASSESSMENT ANALYZED FOR SENATE HEARINGS:

The OECD asserted that Canada spent only .2% of GDP on early learning and child care. But this was false. Testimony revealed that the government spends about .9 percent, excluding expenditures by families.

"unlike other countries' investments, which may include child care expenditures, Canada's figures in this report include only junior kindergarten and kindergarten. In other words, our figures exclude investments in early learning and child care."

* p75 OECD ECEC "CANADA Country Note" <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/42/34/33850725.pdf>

* [http://www.parl.gc.ca/39/1/parlbus/commbus/senate/Com-e/soci-e/24evb-e.htm?Language=E&Parl=39&Ses=1&comm_id=47,](http://www.parl.gc.ca/39/1/parlbus/commbus/senate/Com-e/soci-e/24evb-e.htm?Language=E&Parl=39&Ses=1&comm_id=47)

Propaganda function of "international assessments" documented

OECD ON 'RANKING': OCED paper, "Peer Review: a Tool for Co-operation and Change,"

"peer review and peer pressure " including techniques such as "ranking" countries are used in order to have "an impact...on domestic public opinion, national administrations and policy makers."

* "[PEER REVIEW: A TOOL FOR CO-OPERATION AND CHANGE An Analysis of an OECD Working Method](#)" by Fabrizio Pagani. OECD GENERAL SECRETARIAT DIRECTORATE FOR LEGAL AFFAIRS
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/33/16/1955285.pdf>

Rianne Mahon, Carlton University sociologist, in a revealing insiders' paper for Martha Friendly's daycare lobby organization, CRRU, describes the propaganda purpose of the "rankings" found in such reports. She explains how the OECD's ECEC unit created an ideologically motivated international daycare lobby network that is not "family friendly" which employs "international assessments" to shame member states into following the OECD party line.

EDITING of OECD ECEC reports deliberately conceals problematic findings from politicians says the lobby of its own work:

RIANNE MAHON ON OECD DAYCARE ACTIVISM AND STRATEGY:

“Editing tends to be most prominent in certain parts of the reports – ie the executive summaries, introduction, and conclusions – which are most likely to be read by time-pressed policy makers.”

“Broad policy documents certainly contribute to shaping the social policy paradigm of member states. It is through the publication of country-specific assessments, however, that the OECD is able to employ the ‘name and shame’ instrument of peer review to press ‘laggards’ to learn.”

“The [OECD’s] ECEC unit’s perspective represents more of a challenge to the status quo.” Mahon contrasts it with “the family-friendly unit.” “Its potential strength comes from the way it structured the review process. It carried out its work in such a way as to draw in and develop a transnational network of early childhood specialists and advocates... distinguishable largely by the centrality of principled ideas or values in motivating their formation.”

“In this it has built on, and extended, the earlier work of the European Commission’s Childcare Network. Just as the latter forged links among child care advocates operating at different scales—local and national—adding the European, the ECEC branch has done the same across the OECD.”

“Its success, of course, will depend on the capacity of advocates to make good use of these reports in their struggles.”

* The OECD and the reconciliation agenda: Competing blueprints published by the Childcare Resource & Research Unit University of Toronto Occasional Paper # 20, pp.13-25
<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op20/op20.pdf>

OECD ideological bias against ‘familialism’ and ‘maternalism’ documented

Mahon’s paper describes the OECD’s ideological agenda:

The OECD is “an active participant in the push to eliminate the last vestiges of maternalism.”

It rejects “neo-familialism’s long [maternity and parental] leaves... as destructive of mothers’ human capital and weakening their labour market attachment.”

PASCAL rephrases it: *“Although in some ways a means and measure of continued progress towards the goal of equality of opportunity for women, leave that is ‘too long and too maternal’ can undermine progress towards gender equality, as extended leave may make the return to work more difficult for both mothers and employers.”* p16 Pascal Report

It “counsels the rejection of maternalism in favour of supports for the new dual earner (or lone parent earner) family.”

It “counsels the establishment of an ECEC system that would offer quality care to all children, irrespective of the labour market status of their parents.”

“Countries are encouraged to move to individual, rather than family, taxation.”

For lone parents "The 'welfare to work' orientation is to be embraced by all."

* The OECD and the reconciliation agenda: Competing blueprints" published by the Childcare Resource & Research Unit University of Toronto Occasional Paper # 20, pp.13-25

<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op20/op20.pdf>

Cover up of OECD bias by head of OECD's 2003 Canada review

In an attempt to cover up the OECD's social paradigm-shaping machinations described above by Mahon, John Bennett, head of the OECD's review of Canada, claimed in a letter to the *National Post* that:

OECD: "The OECD has no bias, conscious or unconscious, against families taking care of their own children."

* *National Post* December 8, 2006 p A19

Cover up of OECD ties to Canada's daycare lobby

In letters in the *National Post*, both Martha Friendly and the OECD's John Bennett, head of the OECD's review of Canada, publicly denied her participation in the OECD's review reports.

The OECD's "Country Note" Report headed by Bennett states:

"In particular, we would like to acknowledge their efficient preparation of the Background Report...A special word of thanks is due also to the authors of the Background Report—Gillian Doherty, Martha Friendly and Jane Beach."

MACLEANS' MAGAZINE ON OECD REPORT:

"Even last week's timely OECD report, which looked like an authoritative critique from abroad, was in fact largely based on research commissioned by Dryden's department. John Bennett, the Paris-based project manager for the OECD review, said he 'relied to a great extent' on that detailed background study written by Canadians, including Martha Friendly, coordinator of the University of Toronto's Childcare Resource and Research Unit."

* "Lessons in Daycare" *Macleans*'s Nov 8, 2004

http://www.macleans.ca/article.jsp?content=20041108_91860_91860&source=srch

However, the *National Post*, Ms Friendly made the disingenuous claim, without mentioning her work on the Background Report:

MARTHA FRIENDLY: "I neither authored, ghost-wrote nor engineered this [Country Note] report."

In the same issue of the *National Post*, Bennett also denied and covered up Ms Friendly's involvement.

JOHN BENNETT: "the (OECD) report on Canada, 2004, was an external report, written by three experts from Belgium, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The statement...that the report was 'written in part by Toronto-based childcare advocate Martha Friendly' is inexact and misleading."

* *National Post* December 8, 2006 p A19

The Perry Preschool \$17-for-1 evidence

PASCAL REPORT USES PERRY PRESCHOOL PROJECT EVIDENCE: *“The Ypsilanti, Michigan study has spent 40 years tracking the cost-benefits of a preschool and family intervention program on a group of inner city minority children. It calculates \$17 savings on health, justice and social welfare savings for every \$1 spent on the program.” P12*

This is the infamous Perry Preschool Project experiment which Pascal is apparently avoiding naming perhaps because it has been discredited publicly many times. Arguments for ‘universal’ programs start with Perry and such ‘hot house’ targeted intervention projects, skew findings and costs, and then propose “scaling up” to mass programs. In nearly half a century it has never been repeated. The \$17 savings – later scaled down to \$16 when double counting was found – was self-published in a non-peer-reviewed paper by the High/Scope Foundation which conducted the project years ago, and which makes money selling its pre-school teaching materials to states.

EPPI CENTRE ON PERRY PROJECT: *“Politicians and policy-makers should stop basing the case for expanding early years provision on old, inaccurate and decontextualized data about long-term economic benefits, a research study has concluded.”*

”On the basis of this review, the widespread international use of the most favourable headline findings, and in particular of the Perry High/Scope study, is unjustified. Apart from the variation within and between studies, and problems of interpretation of the results, especially crime figures, there is also a problem about the context in which these studies were carried out.”

”Care should be taken in the reporting of cost–benefit analysis. Headline figures given as point estimates (e.g. \$7 saved for every \$1 spent) can be misleading.”

* “What is known about the long-term economic impact of centre-based early childhood interventions?” May 2006 Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre) Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London. Press release
<http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=720&language=en-US>
 summary <http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=676&language=en-US>

The Perry participants

- only 58 children in the project, 65 children as a control group
- in a high crime, American inner city area
- African-American children only
- children were required to have low I.Q.s – averaging 70 – far below general populace average of 100
- children were required to be of very low assessed ‘socio-economic’ standing
- mothers were single, who had previously been teen mums, were ‘stay-at-home’, and eligible for welfare – impossible now due to ‘welfare reform’ and ‘workfare’ programs introduced in late 1990s

The Perry program

- not daycare or preschool or all-day kindergarten or ‘extended day’
- conducted 48 years ago in 1962 in Ypsilanti, (Detroit) Michigan
- was a highly targeted, carefully designed, experimental project
- the experiment has never been repeated
- was not a “single component” - ie classroom-only program as daycares are. There were 4 components:

- 1 Most mothers were on welfare, thus able to be highly involved in the program and not required to take or train for jobs
- 2 Mothers participated in "regular" meetings.
- 3 Teachers did 1½ hour weekly home visits.
- 4 Children spent only 2½ hours per day in classroom setting for 30 wks/yr for 2 yrs
- child:teacher ratio was 5 or 6 to 1 (Canadian preschools allow 15:1, daycare centres 8-10:1)
- used specially trained teachers with graduate degrees
- 'High/Scope' specially designed intensive, exploratory play & problem-solving program

There is no reason to presume that the classroom component rather than the mothers' "regular" meetings, and/or the home visits produced results. The elimination of welfare eligibility under "welfare reform" in the 1990s eliminated the underlying support the families depended on according to the RAND Corporation.

RAND ON PERRY PROJECT: "The evidence that the Perry Preschool program was a good societal investment in the early 1960s is strong circumstantial evidence but not proof that a replication today would also be a good investment. Much has changed in the intervening four decades."

* RAND "Assessing Costs and Benefits of Early Childhood Intervention Programs" 2001
http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1336/MR1336.ch4.pdf p70

"Previous demonstrations were carried out under the now-superseded welfare system. Costs and savings may be different under the new system."

* RAND "Early Childhood Interventions: Benefits, Costs, and Savings" 2001
http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB5014/index1.html

LOW-BALL COST CALCULATIONS

PADDED BENEFITS CALCULATION

<p>INCLUDED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *ONLY cost of "program operation" \$15,827 (in 2000 \$'s) <p>EXCLUDED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Education/training of staff *Government bureaucracy that would be needed for 'universal' program *Capital costs *Welfare for families up to child age 18 *46 yrs of research/analysis of outcomes *Opportunity cost of volunteered time (mothers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *\$160,597 (in 2000 \$'s) saved per participant at age 40 in "crime victimization" – speculated "savings on in-court and out-of-court settlements for would-be victims of crime" and savings to the justice system *\$2,918 (in 1993 \$'s) by age in reduced use of welfare reported in 1992. This was later changed to a NEGATIVE benefit of -\$757 (in 2000 \$'s) at age 40.
---	---

-“Errata” Lifetime Effects: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 40

http://www.highscope.org/file/Research/PerryProject/Errata_3Final.pdf

-The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 40: Summary, Conclusions, and Frequently Asked Questions

http://www.highscope.org/file/Research/PerryProject/3_specialsummary%20col%2006%2007.pdf

-“Public Policy Report: Success by Empowerment – The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project Through Age 27” by Schweinhart & Weikhart in Young Children Nov 1993

II - Evidence of lasting harms and no lasting benefit resulting from similar policies

1-SWEDEN – the OECD’s “model” of the “integrated approach”

academic outcomes plummeting

Canadian teens far outperform Swedish teens on all OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) academic tests: we score an average of 534 against their 503. Canada is almost at the top, well above the OECD average, while big-daycare Sweden and France are below the OECD average.

* "Measuring Up: Canadian Results of the OECD PISA Study The Performance of Canada's Youth in Science, Reading and Mathematics: 2006 First Results for Canadians Aged 15" charts p 60-64
<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/81-590-x/81-590-x2007001-eng.pdf>

Swedish academic outcomes have plummeted in the long years of mass daycare.

youth violence and youth suicide worsening

PASCAL REPORT: “We will see...a reduction of youth violence”(p6-7)

SWEDISH NATIONAL BOARD OF HEALTH AND WELFARE: “Youth suicide has “risen dramatically.””

“psychological problems are increasing among young people and women...Violence is also an increasing problem...with roughly one in ten residents having been subject to some sort of violence.”

* reported in “Young Swedes' mental health deteriorating: report” Published: 25 Mar 09, The Local-Swedens’ News in English <http://www.thelocal.se/18444/20090325/>

illness

PACAL REPORT: “We will see...greater well-being of 12 year olds including greater resiliency and health outcomes”(p6-7)

SWEDISH NATIONAL BOARD OF HEALTH AND WELFARE: Children in centre care are 6.78 times more likely to be sick than children in parental care.

* page 18 of Sweden’s National Board of Health and Welfare’s publication “Smitta I förskolan” (Eng. approx.: “Contagion in preschool”) <http://www.socialstyrelsen.se/Publicerat/2008/10130/2008-126-1.htm>

quality of children’s care

THE SWEDISH MINISTRY OF EDUCATION:

There is a negative “unintended development” resulting from integration daycare into the education system

"[it] may well be that the preconditions for providing good overall quality have deteriorated, especially as a result of large groups of children and fewer staff"

"a recurring theme in the interviews [with staff and heads of daycares]...was that the parents have the main responsibility for their children and that staff are not to usurp this responsibility" (p. 27)

"pre-school's incorporation into the education system has created, from a professional perspective, 'benefits' in that the pre-school gains higher status and increased legitimacy....[However] Based on a child's perspective, the benefits may be more uncertain" (p.40)

"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)

* Pre-School in Transition: A national evaluation of the Swedish pre-school, 2004

[http://www.skolverket.se/sb/d/193/url/0068007400740070003a002f002f007700770034002e0073006b006f006c007600650072006b00650074002e00730065003a0038003000380030002f00770074007000750062002f00770073002f0073006b006f006c0062006f006b002f0077007000750062006500780074002f0074007200790063006b00730061006b002f005200650063006f00720064003f006b003d0031003300370038/target/Record%3Fk%3D1378](http://www.skolverket.se/sb/d/193/url/0068007400740070003a002f002f0077007700770034002e0073006b006f006c007600650072006b00650074002e00730065003a0038003000380030002f00770074007000750062002f00770073002f0073006b006f006c0062006f006b002f0077007000750062006500780074002f0074007200790063006b00730061006b002f005200650063006f00720064003f006b003d0031003300370038/target/Record%3Fk%3D1378)

OECD ON SWEDEN: it notes a “problem of quality” and “deteriorating quality” for Sweden while holding Sweden as the “model” for the rest of the OECD states.

* OECD Country Note Early Childhood Education and Care Policy in Sweden

<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/52/31/2534972.pdf> p 30

Even though John Bennett and Peter Moss, whom Pascal notes he met and whose polemical paper he cites, are a leading promoter internationally of this agenda, they admit there is not evidence to support it and cite problems with Sweden:

BENNETT (OECD) AND MOSS (EU) WHO ARE CITED BY PASCAL AS SUPPORTIVE:

“Despite the potential significance of bringing ECEC into the education system, there is little up-to-date research evidence about the process or the consequences.”

integration has produced negative "schoolification in Sweden"

* “Toward a new pedagogical meeting place? Bringing early childhood into the education system” --

Briefing paper for a Nuffield Educational Seminar; Peter Moss & John Bennett, Nuffield Foundation, 26 Sep 06 www.nuffieldfoundation.org/fileLibrary/doc/briefingpaper.draft3.august17.doc

women's equality

Swedish women experience increased domestic violence

CBC interview “The Current” May 27, 2005 <http://www.cbc.ca/thecurrent/2005/200505/20050527.html>

Sweden has one of the most highly sex-segregated workforces in the OECD, with women concentrated in low-pay public sector jobs

”However, the gender gap decreases very slowly.”

”If they would demand (and get) compensation, all achievements in female dominated sectors will disappear into inflation”

”According to Statistics Sweden ([SCB](#)), the primary explanation concerning gender inequalities seems to be choice of occupation. According to the survey, women are more likely than men to take up work within low-wage professions.”

* European Industrial Relations Observatory

<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/studies/tn0808019s/se0808019q.htm>

OECD:

”Sweden needs to address gender equity issues. There is strong gender segregation in public service employment (health, education, and childcare); women rather than men reduce working hours after childbirth, and long periods of leave (or reduced working hours) do not help female career progression. As a result, pay differences remain significant, and are not narrowing. Among the top 20% of male and female earners, the gender wage gap is 19% in Sweden compared to the OECD average of 16%, and there are proportionally fewer women in management positions in Sweden than in Canada.”

* http://www.oecd.org/document/62/0,3343,en_2649_34819_34916798_1_1_1_1,00.html.

taxation

”formal day-care 2% of GDP, contributing to a tax-to-GDP ratio of over 50%, one of the highest in the OECD.”

* http://www.oecd.org/document/62/0,3343,en_2649_34819_34916798_1_1_1_1,00.html.

2 – **FRANCE**

PASCAL REPORT: *”All Ontario will benefit as more of our children do better in school, build great careers, have their own children, and contribute to our economic prosperity and social cohesion.”*

France has reportedly had nearly 100% of its young children in full time preschool for years but the promise of social cohesion has not been realized. Race related riots have been recurring problems in recent years, and many seniors died alone, neglected in their apartments in a heat wave a few years ago. Canada does far better in this area

3 - QUEBEC

PEER REVIEWED PRIZE WINNING MILLIGAN et al STUDY: *”We uncover striking evidence that children are worse off in a variety of behavioral and health dimensions, ranging from aggression to motor-social skills to illness. Our analysis also suggests that the new childcare program led to more hostile, less consistent parenting, worse parental health, and lower-quality parental relationships.”*

”The consistency of the results suggests that more access to childcare is bad for these children”

“The taxes generated from the increased maternal labor supply fall far short of paying for the increased childcare subsidies.”

* "Universal Childcare, Maternal Labor Supply and Family Well-Being" by Michael Baker (University of Toronto), Jonathan Gruber (MIT) and Kevin Milligan (University of British Columbia) Journal of Political Economy 2008 2005 version available at <http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/cepa/childcare.oct2005.final2.pdf> p1,4

OTHER CANADIAN ECONOMISTS ON QUEBEC SYSTEM: *“...almost 70 percent of families have had to deal with a reduction in governmental financial assistance to facilitate the increase in levels of support for approximately 30 percent of families. The results also show that the financial loss for families increases with the number of children.”*

* Institute for Research on Public Policy Choice – Family Policy Vol. 6, no 1 JANUARY 2000
<http://www.irpp.org/choices/archive/vol6no1.pdf> pp 4-5

“Since the only way to benefit from this program is to choose to go to work, it's not so much a child care program so much as a program designed to encourage mothers to return to work”

* “Equity and Quebec's daycare program” Worthwhile Canadian Initiative
http://worthwhile.typepad.com/worthwhile_canadian_initi/2006/06/on_the_equitabi.html

4 - CALIFORNIA

“These programs fall short on some quality benchmarks, particularly those for the promotion of thinking and language skills.”

“All groups of children in center-based ECE experience quality shortfalls.”

* RAND Corporation 2007 “Room for Improvement in the Use of High-Quality Preschool Programs for California's Children” http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB9358/index1.html

5 - OKLAHOMA, TENNESSEE, GEORGIA

“The Tennessee program is considered a gold-standard. It meets 9 out of 10 criteria for a high-quality program set by the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER)--such as preschool teachers with teaching credentials, small class-size, and comprehensive early-learning standards.”

“Yet, despite this extremely high quality program, an interim study on the program's progress done for the Tennessee Comptroller's Office finds no lasting academic value for Tennessee students who participated in the public pre-kindergarten program.”

“In Oklahoma and Georgia, which both have decade-long universal preschool programs with high quality standards, students score below the national average on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), the nation's benchmark for student achievement. For example, Oklahoma, where state-funded pre-kindergarten has been in place for 18 years - and offered universally for nearly a decade, has slipped below the national average on math and reading scores for both the fourth and eighth grades since it began expanding government preschool.”

“Oklahoma scores fell from one point above the national average in fourth grade math in 1992 to two points behind in 2007. They also slipped behind in eighth grade math, from one point ahead before the pre-K program to five points behind the national average after pre-K was implemented. In reading eighth grade scores slipped from four points ahead in 1998 to one point behind. And Oklahoma's fourth grade reading scores plummeted during the 1990's at the very same time the state was aggressively expanding preschool access, increasing attendance, and building a system that the NIEER rates as a 9 out of 10 on quality.”

* “More Evidence that Universal Preschool Doesn't Offer Lasting Benefits: By second grade the benefits of one of the nation's 'best' universal pre-K programs are gone” Reason Foundation Lisa Snell August 22, 2008 <http://reason.org/news/show/1003109.html>

6 – CANADA

PROMOTERS OF THIS POLICY, DR CLYDE HERTZMAN AND THE HUMAN EARLY LEARNING PARTNERSHIP:

“Pro-social behaviour scores were lowest for children in licensed day care and highest for children in unregulated home care and relative care.”

* Statistics Canada "National Data Sets: Sources of Information for Canadian Child Care Data" by Hertzman and two other HELP staff, p.14 <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11f0019m/11f0019m2006284-eng.pdf>

“OVERVIEW OF THE RESULTS: ... following the introduction of control variables, participating in early childhood care and education programs and services at the age of 2 and 3 had little direct association with children's home and school outcomes in Kindergarten. The sole exception to this general pattern occurred for participation in 'other' [such as parent-child drop ins] early education programs.”

* HELP, *“The association of early childhood care and education to children's experiences in Kindergarten”* February 2006, by Dafna Kohen, Garth Lipps, and Clyde Hertzman (The key finding is buried on page 17 where you may not dig to find it.) http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/documents/ECCE_Kohen_Lipps_Hertzman_Article_March_2006.pdf

7 – BREASTFEEDING

Breastfeeding is an undisputed booster of physical, emotional, and cognitive well-being. Pascal’s report does not even mention it.

III - False assumptions based on mis-leading use of data

1 - shortage of daycare spaces? – waitlists are not reliable data; high vacancy rates

Waitlists are used to argue that there is a “child care crisis” - shortage of daycare spaces. But waitlists are statistically meaningless. They are more like loose ‘reservation lists’. Parents are encouraged by the daycare lobby to put their children’s names on as many lists as possible and as far in advance of use as possible – even before birth. Then names are not removed from lists in a timely manner. Or they are in a space by hope to find a different one. So many names are on lists for ‘years’ because the parents do not want to put the child in for years, or the child is in already.

Waitlists just tell us: parents shop around and plan ahead. The use of waitlists as a propaganda tool by the daycare lobbyists has created problems for parents and daycare providers. Parents cannot be sure of a space until one month or so before it is available because staff will not get ‘notice’ from current parents until that

time. Staff cannot be sure parents are committed to their centre because they cannot force parents to choose their space. Parents may find a better or more suitable centre.

Ontario Auditor general Alain Lalonde's review of children's services:

"There are 19,300 licensed child-care spaces in Ottawa and there are 11,800 children on wait lists. Lalonde's audit says that number doesn't give an accurate picture of the need in the community partly because it is not routinely updated and includes children who are not yet born."

* Ottawa Citizen November 26, 2009

2 – high VACANCY RATES show there is NOT a shortage of supply of daycare spaces

Vacancy rates are a reliable indicator of daycare demand with the important caveat that demand is grossly inflated by current policy which funds daycare center care preferentially. While there is a shortage of "high quality" daycare spaces because the majority of licensed daycare is of "minimal to mediocre quality" according to there is NOT shortage of spaces per se. The vacancy rates in daycare are hidden and not reported publicly but have long been a problem for the industry.

* *You Bet I Care!* 2 http://action.web.ca/home/cfwwb/attach/ybic_report_2.pdf p. ix-x

7.2% vacancy rate in Toronto daycare centers Dec 2009: 2,920 vacancies out of 40,701 spaces in the 653 Toronto daycare centres that have "purchased" (fee subsidy) spaces. Including vacancies in the 293 centers that do not have "purchased" spaces, and vacancies in in-home daycares would increase the vacancy rate.

* Is All-Day K Needed to Ease Daycare Shortage? <http://www.kidsfirstcanada.org/toronto-vacancies.htm>

* scroll down to Child Care Vacancies at Toronto City child care website – updated weekly
http://www.toronto.ca/children/facts_figs.htm

The City of Toronto daycare info website:

"there will always be child care vacancies in the licensed system because of the progression of children from one age group to another as well as the movement of children in and out of the system".

* scroll down to Child Care Vacancies at Toronto City child care website – updated weekly
http://www.toronto.ca/children/facts_figs.htm

"Vacancy rates of this magnitude make it extremely difficult to sustain financial viability."

- **Canada-wide:** 53.7% of daycares reported vacancies. 14.7% had over 1 in 5 spaces vacant.

- **Quebec:** 40% reported vacancies.

* *You Bet I Care!* Report 1, 2000, pp. 163-168 http://action.web.ca/home/cfwwb/attach/ybic_report_1.pdf

- **BC** In 2001 38.2% of daycare centres for age 0-2 reported "available vacant spaces" with 5.1 mean number of vacancies; age 3-5 49.3% reported vacancies with a mean of 5.6 spaces; school-age 52.5% with a mean of 7.3 spaces.

* *2001 Provincial Child Care Survey Final Report*

http://www.mcf.gov.bc.ca/childcare/ChildCar/PDFs/part_iii.pdf– p 55-56 removed from web

3 - Parental preference as measure of demand for daycare care spaces

Vanier Institute poll: "9 out of 10 say 1 parent should be at home with preschool child" and 6+/10 say same for elementary age child. 2004

Of those 10% (1 in 10) who did not prefer "1 parent should be at home with preschool child," parental care was still the preferred care form: parental care is ranked #1, daycare centre care is ranked #5

* http://www.vifamily.ca/library/future/future_toc.html section 5 and section 8 - #5

78% of parents preferred that "a parent stays at home" (not wording we would use) over a "competent caregiver."

* "[Canadians make a choice on child care](#)" The Institute for Marriage and Family Canada poll done in 2006

4 - low use of daycare centre, and cover up of this data by Statistics Canada

Only 14.9 % of children age 6 months to 5 years were in daycare centres full or part time according to Statistics Canada's 2006 Child Care Study. However the press release by **Statistics Canada in The Daily did not report this data.** Instead, headlines said "More than half of Canadian children in some form of child care" and that was then repeated in newspaper headlines. Child care was defined in the fine print as use of any form of non-parental child care while parents worked or studied. **The 14.9 % was buried on page 97** of a 99 page report that had no index to help readers find this key fact in its many tables.

* Stats Can., p97 Child Care in Canada <http://www.statcan.ca/english/research/89-599-MIE/89-599-MIE2006003.pdf>

* Statistics Canada The Daily <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/060405/dq060405a-eng.htm>

Only 3.9% ages 6-11 were in daycare centres full or part time last time this data was published.

* Vanier Institute: Profiling Canadian Families II chart 69a,b, 1995 data from Stats. Can. Nat. Longitudinal Survey of Children & Youth (removed from web)

5 - daycare centre use is much higher than genuine demand

The Vanier survey indicates that well over 90% - nearly 100% - of parents prefer parental care with well under 10 % preferring daycare centres. Yet the Statistics Canada study shows 14.9 % of children age 6 months to 5 years are in daycare centres. This indicates that the number of children in daycare centres is far higher than it would be if parental preferences were respected. Daycare centre care receives far more public money than parental care; this discriminatory policy causes the distortion between genuine demand and actual use.

6 – parents/mothers “working”? – mis-representation and mis-use of mothers’ Labour Force Participation rate data

We are told that 70-80 % of mothers are “working”. But what does this mean? In fact, every mother is a working mother.

Mothers' Labour Force Participation (LFP) rates - the 70% - are used as a **false proxy for demand** for daycare. It is also used to give a false impression that full time jobs are the norm for mothers. Thus statistics are not neutral but are employed to influence behaviour and to coerce mothers into a choice that has been pro-actively normalized by activist statisticians.

STATISTICS CANADA'S DEFINITION OF LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION: includes mothers:
 -on paid and unpaid leave from paid jobs
 -doing any paid work at all –no minimum hours or pay
 -who say they are looking for a job
 -who do unpaid work in a family farm or business.

* Definitions used in Statistics Canada's work data: <http://www.statcan.ca/english/freepub/71-222-XIE/2004000/glossary.htm>

It also includes those who do paid work with their children present, and those who do paid work full time away from their children but do not use or want daycare center care.

Only a small percentage of children have both parents (or their single parent) at full time jobs away from them AND during the 'standard hours' that of proposed all day JK/SK, and 'extended day programs'. And even then the parents may not prefer a relative or home-like setting over the institutional settings considered in this Bill.

7 – false assertions - inconvenience to majority parents in transporting children; preference for all day institutional care

Given the facts about Labour Force participation and use of daycare and parental preference regarding care/learning, the implied assertion by Dr Pascal in media interviews that a majority of parents of 4 and 5 year olds are inconvenienced by having to transport children mid day from school to daycare is shown to be untrue.

8 –Polling of parents and children does not support policy

Dr Pascal frequently asserts that this proposal has massive parental support, but has no evidence to show this. Vanier and other surveys show that it is not true that most parents prefer all day institutional care for their children ages 0-12

If any poll of parental preference has been conducted regarding this policy, it has not been publicized. Either way there is no evidence that the majority of parents directly affected support this policy.

No poll has ever shown that parent want less time with their young children.

Promoters of this policy speak loudly of "children's rights" and include the right to a say in decisions regarding their care. Yet children have not been asked at all, and no poll has shown or is likely to show that little children want less time with their parents and more time in school.

IV - Evidence of benefits from later not earlier school entry age

1 –FINLAND

Finnish teen score the highest on OECD PISA tests, yet Fins do not begin formal schooling – that is learning ‘the 3 Rs’ until age 7.

2 - RAND Corporation study

A RAND study found that children who started school later – 72 months that is 6 years - did better on academic tests than those who started earlier.

* See charts pp 110-112, ”The Impact of Changes in Kindergarten Entrance Age Policies on Children’s Academic Achievement and the Child Care Needs of Families”

http://www.rand.org/pubs/rgs_dissertations/RGSD177/

3-The Early Development Instrument (EDI)

PASCAL REPORT ON EDI RESULTS: *“More than one in four children enter grade one significantly behind their peers. Too many never entirely close the gap and go on to disruptive behaviour...Too many end up leading lives of misery, harmful to themselves and others”* p4

EDI HANDBOOK ON PROPAGANDA PURPOSE OF EDI: *“How EDI Results Can Influence Policy and Social Change. The EDI scores can provide a powerful catalyst for influencing policy and programming decisions*

* http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/pubs/2007_12_FINAL.EDI.HANDBOOK.pdf

Though the EDI is used by Pascal and others to promote increasing institutional child care/learning and school all day for ages 3-5, this conclusion is not supported by the EDI findings. **The EDI finds that kindergarten children who are older - not younger - have higher rates of “school readiness to learn”.**

* [School Readiness to Learn National SK Cohort Results](http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/pubs/2008_11_12_National_SK_Cohort.pdf) p15

http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/pubs/2008_11_12_National_SK_Cohort.pdf

V – Ideology

The ideological agenda and the political strategy underlying Bill 242 and related policies is laid out clearly in papers written by and for the daycare lobby nationally and internationally. These are ‘insider’ papers not meant for public consumption. Individuals working with the European Commission, OECD’s ECEC Unit and the World Bank are the primary creators and strategists of the policy agenda that is disseminated in Canada at the national and provincial level by actors such as Martha Friendly/CRRU; Fraser Mustard, Charles Coffey, and Clyde Hertzman (Council on Early Child Development, Human Early Learning Partnership, Canadian Institutes for Health Research).

1 - OECD

“the neo-familial view of child development: maternal care in the early years is understood as in the best interests of the child. While this position was supported in the 1950s and 1960s by child development experts like Bowlby, [the founder of attachment theory] the dominant view today sees a role for quality childhood education and care.”

“The OECD and the Reconciliation Agenda: Competing Blueprints,” R. Mahon

<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op20/op20.pdf> p4

Some of the OECD’s role and strategy is explained in section on international assessments above (pp 11-16).

THE “INTEGRATION” AGENDA

PASCAL REPORT: *“...fragmented patchwork...chaotic mix...web of unsolved problems...a jumble... the fragmentation that plagues...”*

Dr Pascal and other promoters of ‘seamless’ ‘universal’s state child care systems say this diverse ‘patchwork’ is the underlying problem that that will be solved by their proposals.

The OECD’s “integrated approach” is intended to eliminate this supposed patchwork problem. The agenda is politically unmarketable and mapped out secretly. The ideology behind “integration” is anti-family, statist, undemocratic, and consumerist. OECD and related ECEC policy papers demonstrate this. We focus on one here.

In 2001 the OECD and UNESCO commissioned a **“state of the art” “blueprint”** paper on Early Childhood Education and Care by Brazilian Lenira Haddad called “An integrated approach to early childhood education and care.” This paper was first presented in Sweden in 2001 at the OECD’s International Conference on Early Childhood Education and Care: International Policy Issues. John Bennett headed the OECD’s review work at this time, and had worked for UNESCO previously. He became deeply involved in Canadian policy and met with Dr Pascal.

In 2002 the Haddad “blueprint” was published and widely circulated to daycare lobbyists nationally and internationally by Canada’s Childcare Resource and Research Unit long run by Martha Friendly. That was funded with tax-payers’ money from the Child Care Visions program in Human Resources Development Canada <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op16/op16.pdf>

In 2002 the paper was then published in a longer final form by UNESCO.

<http://www.ctc-health.org.cn/file/20080527005.pdf>.

In 2003 John Bennett headed an OECD review of ECEC in Canada using the Martha Friendly’s CRRU “Background” paper. Helen Penn (see below) of the European Commission Network on Childcare was a member of the team. It recommended the strategy employed in this Bill: using kindergarten as a “bridge” to universal daycare. Penn has also worked closely with Martha Friendly CRRU.

“ One means of providing a universal service – and one which seems to have the favour of Canadian parents (Johnson and Mathien, 1998) – would be to develop the present school based, kindergarten service. This offer could be expanded to full-day kindergarten (as is already the case in some places in Canada), with the addition of full-day pre-kindergarten whenever possible.... The aim would be to provide a free morning education service for all children from the age of 4 years, followed by a subsidised recreational and early learning session in the afternoon. ... A parallel increase in out-of-school provision for school age children could also be envisaged”

“Build bridges between child care and kindergarten education, with the aim of integrating ECEC both at ground level and at policy and management levels...A shift in kindergarten opening hours toward full-day provision.”

* OECD Early Childhood Education and Care Policy “CANADA Country Note” p 71, 76
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/42/34/33850725.pdf>

In November 2005 in Toronto the Integration Network Project held a symposium titled [The Unhurried Day: Learning and Caring Seamlessly](#) that brought together daycare, school, preschool activists and bureaucrats. The World Bank and business interests were represented by Charles Coffey RBC Vice President.

In 2006 Haddad’s was re-published as, “Integrated policies for early childhood education and care: challenges, pitfalls and possibilities” Cadernos de Pesquisa vol.26 no.129 São Paulo Sept./Dec. 2006
http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S0100-15742006000300002&script=sci_arttext&tlng=en

The quotes below from the CRRU and the 2006 versions of Haddad’s paper.

* indicates the CRRU’s “preliminary study” version

* *“a hierarchy of priorities for the process of ECEC integration ...proceeding to the further conquest of a strong and equal partnership with the schools.”*

Julie Mathien from Ontario Ministry of Children and Youth Services in introduction to paper

**“The dominant view from the past, strongly influenced by the “ideology of the family” is that the education and upbringing of young children is a private affair and not a public responsibility.”*

**We are in a “transitional period from an old to a new order. This includes deep changes in societies in general and in the family’s structure in particular, ... call for a review of the family-state relationship regarding the responsibility for the care and education of children.”*

“The challenge is to attain greater state participation, including provision for all child development stages from birth to entry into formal schooling, to avoid the tendency to revive the idea of family primacy over early childhood.”

“avoid the tendency to revive the idea of family primacy over early childhood.”

“there is a strong tendency to devolve public responsibility upon private enterprise in countries where education and care of young children are considered a parents’ task”

“The integrated approach to ECEC systems stems from a paradigm shift, in which the responsibility for the care and socialization of young child is no longer the family alone, but of society as a whole, shifting from a deficit model to a model based on human rights. It results that a significant portion of the upbringing process has become a public matter,”

“However, in many countries, the government still hesitates in intervening in the family domain, particularly when it means investing in children under 3 and providing full-time programs.”

“Parental Involvement : Deviations from the concept of parents’ involvement may include actions such as asking parents to do tasks, or assume ECEC staff’s responsibilities; having parents offer regular voluntary help, or considering them a source of financial resources.”

“□integrated administrative responsibilities at both national and local levels, in which preferably all services for young children be subordinated to one ministry”

“the vision of integration in this article goes beyond the local and administrative dimensions and highlights the changes of attitude concerning the role of government and society regarding child education, care and socialization.”

“The split between child care and early childhood education services was exacerbated in capitalist-oriented countries during the period of cold war as a movement away from the principles underlying the “collective care” of communist countries, as the expansion of this type of early collective education was seen as a threat to the capitalist political system, which was grounded on the primacy of the family. In communist societies, services for young children were seen as an important component for revolution strategies”

“The 1945 Revolution in Vietnam, ...introduced deep changes in family life, the status of women, and child care and education practices. ...policy supporting the development of day-care centres and nursery schools was clearly built on the principle of joint responsibility, shared by the family, state and society”

“in the midst of the military dictatorship, Brazil saw several social movements that resulted in a political opening... a new concept of day-care services as a matter of legal right”

“In socialist or former communist countries, such as China, Vietnam, Cambodia and the Czech Republic, where childcare was basically the state’s responsibility, the shift to an open market economy has led to a dramatic reduction in services for children under three”.

2 - The European Commission Network on Childcare and Other Measures to Reconcile Employment with Family Responsibilities

Papers first written for the European Commission by Helen Penn were published by the CRRU in Canada and disseminated widely. They demonstrate contempt for empirical evidence and attachment theory which is to developmental science what gravity is to engineering.

“Firstly, ‘quality’ [of care] is a relative concept”

“Definitions of quality cannot be based on empirical research, since they emerge from a consensus about core values and their practical approach” [emphasis in original].

* “A Framework for Quality: A European Perspective” Helen Penn for The European Commission Network on Childcare and Other Measures to Reconcile Employment with Family Responsibilities
<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/fs/fs6.pdf>

* **“Anglo-American... Empirical research methodologies in child development may produce impeccable data, but they do not guarantee that the questions being asked in the first place are value free.”**

* “Values and Beliefs in Caring for Babies and Toddlers” CRRU Fact Sheet - Helen Penn
<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/fs/fs7.pdf>

* “Briefing Notes: Quality targets in services for young children”
www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/pdf/BN_qualityservicetargets.pdf/

“The concept ...that a very young child learns best through the close emotional security of a relationship with one adult, is a culturally specific one, and is not generally shared by member states....ratios...should reflect the objectives of the service.”

*“A Framework for Quality: A European Perspective” Helen Penn for The European Commission Network on Childcare and Other Measures to Reconcile Employment with Family Responsibilities
<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/fs/fs6.pdf>

“In Anglo-American context, attachment theory has been important....This posits that a warm continuous relationship with a mother or mother figure in infancy is essential to mental health.”

* “Values and Beliefs in Caring for Babies and Toddlers” CRRU Fact Sheet - Helen Penn
<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/fs/fs7.pdf>

“[In Europe] Alternate theories place less emphasis on mothering or substitute mothering and more emphasis on developing relationships between children themselves[Methods’] stress the importance of maintaining children’s autonomy by minimizing adult interference , and mediating as little as possible in baby and toddler activities....What role should adults play in very young children’s learning...turns on...the extent to which young children are trusted with the freedom to explore out of the range of adult gaze.”

-“Values and Beliefs in Caring for Babies and Toddlers” CRRU Fact Sheet - Helen Penn
<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/fs/fs7.pdf>

3 – The World Bank

Funding

Lenira Haddad (see above) states that the World Bank is the main funder of “Early Child Development” initiatives.

WORLD BANK: *“The World Bank has increased its investment in ECD programs from approximately US\$ 126 million in 1990 to a total of about US\$ 1.6 billion in 2006...The Bank also serves as a center for knowledge sharing, capacity building, technical assistance, and advice on policies that affect young children.”*

* [World Bank Early Child Development \(ECD\) Projects](http://go.worldbank.org/57K8MKSD90) <http://go.worldbank.org/57K8MKSD90>

“this Report Card advances the idea of an internationally applicable set of benchmarks suggested, drawn up in consultation with government officials and academic experts from OECD countries in Asia, Europe, and North America, with additional input from both UNICEF and the World Bank...”(Unicef Innocenti Centre Report Card p7)

The World Bank created a ‘cost benefit’ Early Child Development (ECD) Calculator to encourage government’s in preferentially spending on daycare and related non-parental care services

* <http://go.worldbank.org/EI8V1LV730>

Canadian ECEC policy makers who are also consultants with the World Bank include:

- **Clyde Hertzman** – World Bank staff in Europe in 1990s currently a Bank consultant; President of Council on Early Child Development (CECD), Director of BC government’s daycare advocacy organization the Human Early Learning Partnership (HELP), advisory board member Can Inst for Health Research

- **Fraser Mustard** - founder of CECD: to the Senate: *"When you achieve fame for something you were never trained in, it is amazing what your contacts are. I have been working for the World Bank and the bank for Latin America."*

http://www.parl.gc.ca/39/2/parlbus/commbus/senate/com-e/soci-e/45189-e.htm?Language=E&Parl-39&Ses=2&comm_id=47

- **Charles Coffey** – former President CECD, former VP RBC

- **Alan Pence** - HELP

- **Judith Evans** - HELP

- **Jane Bertrand** - HELP

- **M. Janus** – Offord Centre

The Bank's thinking

FRASER MUSTARD:

"17% of parents are godawful" and only one third are "competent."

* *Toronto Star Mar 26, 2007 pg. A-1*

CHARLES COFFEY

In a 2005 speech to the World Bank, Coffey praises Mustard and sets out the World Bank agenda:

"In essence, early child development is gradually becoming an industry worthy of investment and important to economic growth. It has fostered new relationships with business, government and economic development experts. It has the potential to spawn new approaches to data collection, planning, professional development, management, finance, government policy, and advocacy."

" investments in child care as an industry that produces jobs and stimulates the economy. The third petal represents parents and the economic contributions they make to the economy, as employees and consumers."

* See Coffey's speech at World Bank: <http://www1.worldbank.org/hdnetwork/External/cy/ccoffey.htm>

This is not about equality for women

Mahon's OECD paper partially explains the business interest. Profits will be increased as:

1- Daycare acts as a low wage subsidy, *"(directly or indirectly) subsidizing low wage employment ('welfare in work')"*.

2 – Women's equality is redefined to serve business interests rather than women's free choice and autonomy: *"The goal would be to re-define equality and security in terms of barriers towards life-course [labour market] flexibility, and to avoid definitions which suggest that the goal of social policy is to provide protection against flexibility"*

* "The OECD and the Reconciliation Agenda: Competing Blueprints," published by CRRU

<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op20/op20.pdf>

The Economist Magazine further explains:

3 - Daycare keeps wage increases at bay by swelling the labour supply with mothers who being women, *“usually cost less to employ than men, are more prepared to be flexible and less inclined to kick up a fuss if working conditions are poor. Far fewer of them are members of trade unions”*.

4 - *“Being able to draw on a larger pool of available workers improves the quality of labour, reduces the risk of shortages and raises demand, not least for goods and services that will make a working woman's life easier: labour-saving devices, convenience foods, meals out, child care. And it increases sales of convenience food and daycare.”*

* **The Economist. Women and work: For better, for worse** .London: Jul 18, 1998. Vol. 348, Iss. 8077