

DRAFT: REPORT: DAYCARE FACT & FICTION, IDEOLOGY & AGENDAS: update: June 2006

Kids First Parent Association of Canada www.kidsfirstcanada.org 604-291-0088

Public policy must be based on *informed* and *democratic* debate. However, policy about children is based on misinformation and the systemic marginalization of opposing views. This Report is intended to expose and address this.
Helen Ward, author, President, Kids First Parent Assoc. of Canada

CONTENTS

WE HEAR THE FICTION, GET THE FACTS

- p 1 - I – Is there a child care crisis? What about wait lists, shortages?
- p 2 - II – What does “70 per cent of mothers are working” mean?
- p 3 - III – Are high quality care and accountability assured by government regulation?
- p 3 - IV – Is child care that is unregulated by government of low quality?
- p 4 - V – Does “overwhelming” research show daycare improves children’s developmental outcomes?
- p 5 - VI - Does “every \$1 invested in daycare, save \$2 - \$7”?
- p 6 - VII – Does daycare improve “human capital formation” & global competitiveness in “Knowledge Based Economy”
- p 6 - VIII – Does Quebec have an excellent universal, high quality daycare system?
- p 7 - IX – Does Sweden have an excellent universal, high quality daycare system?
- p 7 - X – Does daycare lower child poverty rates?
- p 9 - XI – Who funds the daycare lobby?
- p 10 - XII– Are voters, women, and parents demanding government fund a universal daycare system?
- p 11 - XIII– How much would Universal Quality daycare cost?
- p 12- XIV– What is the recommended duration for breastfeeding?

p 12 - ***IDEOLOGY & AGENDAS – STRATEGIES***

- p 12- I – Engineering Political Will and Societal Attitudes
- p 13 - II – Rejection of Evidence from Developmental Science
- p 14 - III– Discrimination in legislation: definitions of “child care” and “work”
- p 15 - IV– Discrimination in language

p 15 - ***IDEOLOGY & AGENDAS - GOALS***

- p 15 - I – “Shared Responsibility”: increasing state intervention in child rearing, decreasing parents’ role
- p 15 - II – “Labour Force Attachment” vs Parent-Child Attachment: Care as Commodity, Increasing GDP, taxes, profits

Fiction: THERE IS A CHILD CARE CRISIS: FULL WAIT LISTS MEAN A SHORTAGE OF SPACES

Facts: There is no “child care crisis”

1 – FEW CHILDREN ARE IN DAYCARE

*Less than 10% age 0-12 are in daycare full-time or part-time. (2001)Age 1-5yrs: outside Quebec 10%. Quebec age 1-5: 21%, under age one 9% (2002). Canada-wide age 6 mos-5yrs: 15.1%. Stats Canada’s March 2006 report does not give the actual percentage in the entire 99 page report.

* Age 6-11: 3.9%.

-Merrigan and Lefebvre Low Fee Regulated Childcare” <http://132.203.59.36/CIRPEE/cahierscirpee/2005/files/CIRPEE05-08.pdf> p34

-Que daycare use by age: Quality Counts! <http://www.irpp.org/choices/archive/vol11no5.pdf> p10

-Child Care in Canada <http://www.statcan.ca/english/research/89-599-MIE/89-599-MIE2006003.pdf>, p. 6,14

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

3 - The daycare lobby says “wait lists are full!” giving the impression that demand is in excess of supply.

*“*The Liberal government's Social Development Minister, Ken Dryden, said the problem in Canada is **not a shortage of child-care spots***”

Globe & Mail Dec 6 2005.

*The daycare lobby will claim a “shortage” until every child is in daycare: “*Until every child has a place in universal high quality child care, a woman’s place is in the struggle. So la lutte continue, sisters.*”

*The majority of daycares have **vacancies** (below). Lists are for "reserving" more than "waiting". Lists are not systematized, names can be on many lists. Those who are unborn, in daycare already, or whose parents' plan to use it in future are on lists. In Quebec, when it was pointed out that if children are waiting they are not getting the service, it was admitted that lists do not indicate demand. Quebec plans to centralize lists.

4 - HIGH VACANCY RATES: reliable data is collected but suppressed. It shows a surplus of "spaces" and a shortage of children in them despite all the talk of full waiting lists.

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

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

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"*.

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

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

* **BC:** 58.3% reported vacancies, and the overall vacancy rate was 10.8% in 1998. 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. *Including* part-time and full time, drop-in child minding and preschool, there were only 111 children enrolled per 1000.

***Toronto:** May 29 2006: Only 9 of 44 wards report no vacancies for infants. All but 2 wards had vacancies for SUBSIDIZED infant and toddler spaces, almost all had over 10% subsidized spaces vacant. Overall vacancies: infant – 182, toddler – 373, pre-school – 815, school age – 798.

-*You Bet I Care!* – 1, 2000, pp. 163-166 http://action.web.ca/home/cfwwb/attach/ybic_report_1.pdf

-*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

-1997 BC Provincial Child Care Survey

-Toronto child care system "Facts and Figures" http://www.toronto.ca/children/facts_figs.htm

http://www.toronto.ca/children/vac_maps.htm

http://www.toronto.ca/children/ceil_maps.htm <http://www.toronto.ca/children/dmc/vacancy.pdf>

II - Fiction: "THE REALITY IS THAT 70 PER CENT OF MOTHERS ARE WORKING"

Fact: Statistics regarding "work" are abused to argue for more funding for daycare.

1 - **EVERY MOTHER IS A WORKING MOTHER:** We hear from economists and government frequently that some mothers are "not working" (Statistics Canada), "inactive" & "non-active" (OECD), an economic "loss" (Cleveland & Krashinski), at "leisure" (Parliament Finance Ctte). This is untrue, slanderous, misogynistic and creates a climate of contempt towards women as mothers who prioritize care-giving.

-OECD:http://www.oecd.org/document/56/0,2340,en_2649_37457_31687864_1_1_1_37457,00.html

-*The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care* by Cleveland & Krashinski <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/other/benefits/bc.pdf> p73

2 – *"the [British] Office for National Statistics did a valuation of women's homemaking and care, and came up with a figure of £929bn, or 104% of GDP. Combine that with the value of women's paid work, and they are easily outperforming the shockingly low productivity of men."*

"Behind the baby gap lies a culture of contempt for parenthood", Madeline Bunting, The Guardian, March 7, 2006

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/Columnists/Column/0,,1725350,00.html>

3 - The ubiquitous "70% of mothers are working outside the home" statistic is false. It derives from Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey data on "Labour Force Participation." This includes those who:

* do any paid work at all – no minimum hours or pay

* have a job but are away from it, eg on unpaid parental leave

* are on "unemployed", on EI, looking for a job

* do any unpaid work in a family business or farm

* do paid work PT or FT with their children present, eg home daycare, home office

-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>

-National Child Benefit info <http://www.nationalchildbenefit.ca/ncb/progdesc.shtml>

4 -The majority of mothers are not doing full-time jobs, and some in full-time jobs are with their children: self-employment and home offices are increasingly popular options.

5 - 65% of children 0-11 have at least one parent who does not have a full-time job (30 hours/week or more). 33% of children in two-parent families and 55% in one-parent families have a parent who does not participate in "labour force".

- Statistics Canada National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth, *Growing Up in Canada*

III - Fiction: REGULATION BY GOVERNMENT ASSURES HIGH QUALITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Fact: Leading daycare advocates find that most government-regulated child care in Canada "is of minimal to mediocre quality" 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"

-*You Bet I Care!* 2 p. ix-x

-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

1 - Of the 234 licensed daycares that accepted participation in the study, only 44.3% of preschool-age centres and 28.7% of infant/toddler centres and 36.8% of family daycares are "providing activities and materials that support and encourage children's development." That was with staff:child ratios of 1:2.6 to 1:4.8, which are far better than regulation standards. This level was assessed while staff knew they were being assessed.

You Bet I Care! 2, p 73, ix http://action.web.ca/home/cfwwb/attach/ybic_report_2.pdf, Report 3 Executive Summary, Report 2 p34

2 - The child:adult ratio regulations are a major reason why the quality of daycare is so low. In BC, licensing allows staff:child ratios in daycare centres of 1:4 for babies and toddlers, 1:8 for 30 months to grade one, 1:10 for kindergarten to grade 1, and 15:1 for grade 2 and up. Having too many children to care for imposes severe limits on activities and on the adult-child relationship. Yet daycare quality advocates are **not** asking for a lowering of ratios. The maximum hours/day for all ages is 13 hours, 7 days/week. So a newborn could be in daycare with 3 others for 13 hours/day, 7 days/week.

-child:staff ratio regulations http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2001/tables_big/TABLE22.pdf

3 – Quality is worse since the study because ratios have been increased for 1 yr olds in many provinces: in Quebec **one staff for 8 babies** – up from 1:5; Ont: now one staff for 5 babies – up from 1:3.33.

-“Daycare child:staff ratios & ‘Quality’: Bad & Getting Worse” <http://www.kidsfirstcanada.org/blog-vol3.htm>

-ECEC 1998 <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pt98/pdf/big.pdf> CHART 15

-ECEC 2001 http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2001/tables_big/TABLE22.pdf

-ECEC 2004 http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2004/tables_big/TABLE16.pdf

4 – Government agents are NOT ACCOUNTABLE or personally legally liable for failing to ensure children's well-being. Regarding 'developmental outcomes', only parents can possibly regulate this. Policy advisors, advocates, politicians, daycare workers, etc. are **not legally accountable** for problems resulting from daycare or for failing to fulfill daycare's Utopian promises. Parents are held responsible for children's offenses by some new laws (eg BC's Parental Responsibility Act).

IV - Fiction: “UNREGULATED” CARE IS LOW QUALITY

Fact: there are no studies showing poor quality of child care done by those who are not regulated by government: parents, families, nannies, babysitters or friends. **All child care is parent regulated.**

1 - Government brochures handed out in the maternity wards in BC indicate this: “*Although some types of child care are licensed by the Provincial Child Care Facilities Licensing Board, you as the parent must make the final decision as to whether a child care arrangement is a good one.*” [emphasis in original]

-*Parents' Guide to Selecting Child Care: Selecting and Monitoring of Licensed Child Care* p.1

2 - Daycare advocates using scare tactics erroneously claim that parents are using “**illegal**” care simply because it does not include regulation by government. The terms “illegal,” “informal,” “supplemental,” and “unregulated” care can refer to care by: mothers while doing paid work, fathers, grandparents, nannies, siblings.

-Statistics Canada *National Child Care Study: Where are the children?*

- *The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care* Cleveland & Krashinski <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/other/benefits/bc.pdf> p.85

3 - In BC, “**illegal daycare**” is done by **grandparents** or anyone looking after more than 2 children other than their own without a license, paid or unpaid, because they are in violation of regulations.

V - Fiction: DAYCARE AND PRESCHOOL IMPROVE CHILDREN’S DEVELOPMENTAL OUTCOMES

Fact: No “overwhelming research” shows daycare or preschool improves children’s outcomes.

1 - Studies only that show good daycares are somewhat better than bad daycares, that extremely underprivileged children with low I.Q.s or mothers with low I.Q.s have benefit from voluntary “intervention” programmes that include parent empowerment (eg Perry Preschool Project – below). Slightly higher scores on some school tests noted in some preschool studies disappear in a few years.

-*The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care* <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/other/benefits/bc.pdf> pp. 27-29

-“Success by Empowerment: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 27” *Young Children* Nov 1993

2 - Studies also show that the more hours children spend with parents the better their outcomes

-*The Well-Being of Canada’s Children* http://www.socialunion.gc.ca/ecd/2003/report2_e/chapter03_e.html#c35

“The findings, while they do not offer direct support for any particular type of parenting intervention, do reinforce proposals for investing in educating current and future parents about the importance of their role in the psychological well being of their children. Families matter—even for kids in child care.”

Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 24. <http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=49>

3 - The \$25 million US National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health involving over 90,000 adolescents found that “**Across all the health outcomes examined, the results point to the importance of family and the home environment for protecting children from harm. What emerges most consistently is the teenager’s feeling of connectedness with parents and family.**” And, “**Independent of race, ethnicity, family structure and poverty status, adolescents who are connected to their parents, to their families, and to their school community are healthier than those who are not.**” Canada’s daycare lobby never mentions this study.

Journal of the American Medical Assoc., Sept, 1997

4- Studies show that longer hours in non-maternal care, especially daycare centres, produce higher the rates of stress as measured by brain chemicals serotonin and cortisol. Low serotonin is associated with SIDS and addiction.

-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...

-ScienCentral News “Wild Young Brains” Nov 11 2003

www.sciencentral.com/articles/view.php3?language=english&type=&article_id=218392104

-US National Institute of Child Health and Human Development in *Globe and Mail* July 19, 2004

5 – Studies show children who spend longer hours in non-maternal care, especially daycare centres, have higher levels of cruelty, aggression, disobedience

- 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>

6 - Studies show that daycare children get sick much more often

-Child care and common communicable illnesses: Results from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Study of Early Child Care. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 155,* 481-488.

<http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=19>.

-Child care and common communicable illnesses in children aged 37 to 54 months. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 157.*

<http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=43>

7 - Research shows and all agree that children benefit from “sensitive, responsive care” and secure attachment.

-*Attachment and Development*, Susan Goldberg, pp209-210

-The Early Years Study: The Real Brain Drain, Fraser Mustard

8 - Studies show that mothers’ sensitivity is greatest predictor of child’s outcomes compensating even for chronic maternal depression: **“Quality of maternal caregiving was the strongest predictor of cognitive competence, as well as caregivers’ ratings of social competence”**

-Child-care structure>process>outcome: Direct and indirect effects of child-care quality on young children's development.

Psychological Science, 13. <http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=25>

- Chronicity of maternal depressive symptoms, maternal sensitivity, and child functioning at 36 months. Developmental Psychology, 35. <http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=14>

- Child care and children's peer interaction at 24 and 36 months: The NICHD Study of Early Child Care. Child Development, 72. <http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=24>

9 - Studies show that longer hours on non-maternal care are associated with lower maternal sensitivity, poorer maternal attachment, and increased peer attachment.

Child care and mother-child interaction in the first three years of life. Developmental Psychology, 35, 1399-1413.

<http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=15>

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

Child care and family predictors of preschool attachment and stability from infancy. Developmental Psychology, 37.

<http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=26>

-“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>

-Gordon Neufeld & Gabor Mate, *Hold on to Your Kids: Why Parents Matter*

10 - Studies show that higher quality non-maternal care has only modest effects

“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>

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

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>

11 - Research finds positive non-maternal child care found mostly in care by father and relatives

“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.”

-Characteristics and quality of child care for toddlers and preschoolers. Applied Developmental Science, 4.

<http://secc.rti.org/abstracts.cfm?abstract=17>

12 – Recent major British study shows care by mother produces best results for children’s development and that daycare centres produce poorest results, after care by relative, home daycare or nanny.

“Official: babies do best with mother” Oct 2, 2005 *The Observer* http://observer.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,6903,1583072,00.html

VI - Fiction: FOR EVERY \$1 “INVESTED” IN DAYCARE \$2 - \$ 7 ARE SAVED

Fact :This “investment” construct is erroneous

\$2 for \$1

“For every dollar spent on quality child care, \$2 are saved in the long-term” say oft-quoted but rarely read University of Toronto economists, Cleveland and Krashinski. **They review studies such as the “\$7 for \$1” (below) and “assess” :**

*** that mothers’ care is of \$0 benefit while daycare “provides \$3,600 worth of developmental**

benefits” per year per child over mothers’ care

* that care by father, grandparents, nanny, babysitter, etc is of \$0 benefit whiled daycare provides “far better care” – “\$6,000 per year” over these (called “informal” settings).

These ubiquitous high return “investment” figures arise from the need to convince politicians that daycare *saves* money. It is based on (1) ignoring all but the operational costs of daycare, (2) counting \$0 benefit to children, families, society, and the environment of unpaid work, (3) assigning mothers’ \$20,000/yr jobs a \$40,000 value, and (4) deducting no “costs” from jobs or daycare.

-*The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care* <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/other/benefits/bc.pdf> pp.84-85

Despite their support for daycare, these economists caution against daycare for children under age 2: “*No publicly funded child care program, no matter how well designed, can replace the key bonding that occurs between parents and children during the first months of life.*” However this is never mentioned elsewhere.

-*The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care* <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/other/benefits/bc.pdf> p.75-76

\$7-10 for \$1

“For high-risk children, every \$1 spent on quality child care saves \$7 in the long-term.” This hypothesis is presented as fact everywhere. The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project is its source. In Canada “high risk” is defined much more loosely than in this study. In 1962, 58 African-American children age were put into the were put in this high-resource experimental project. They were not typical children:

- They were age 3-4, not 0-2 as in infant/toddler daycare.
- They were selected partly because they had below average I.Q.s (70-85).
- They lived in a high crime area
- They were selected because of their assessed low “socioeconomic status”
- Only 4% had single mothers with outside employment.

The program was not daycare or preschool as we know it. It had 3 components:

- Parents participated in “regular” group meetings.
- Teachers did 1½ hour weekly home visits.
- Children spent 2½ hours per day in class setting.
- Child:adult ratio was 5 or 6 to 1. In BC preschools, regulations allow 15:1.
- Specially trained teachers provided a specially designed intensive, exploratory play & problem-solving program.

Compared to the “control group” of 65 no-program children, by age 27 participants were less likely to be labeled mentally retarded, had higher levels of employment, car ownership, and high-school completion, and lower rates of arrests—only 7% had been arrested more than five times. Higher incomes, speculated (not actual) savings on victim, court, health, and educational cost were estimated, adding up to the \$7 for \$1 savings. Cost did not include research, training, capital, administrative and regulatory costs as this was a unique project.

-“Success by empowerment: the High/Scope Perry Preschool Project through age 27” *Young Children* Nov 1993

-“Benefits, Costs and Explanation of the Perry High/Scope Preschool Program” <http://www.highscope.org/Research/PerryProject/Perry-SRCD-2003.pdf> p.3

“High-risk” children: This term is used to designate not the abused, but every child whose family income is under Statistics Canada’s Before Tax Low-Income Cut-Off (LICO). For a single parent with one child in the city this is \$24,745/year (2003). Many families’ are LICO *because* parents spend less time at jobs in order to do care work. Yet all LICO children are said to be “hungry”, neglected, a “social problem” and “at risk”. This is income-based discrimination: the rich are good parents and the “poor” are bad.

VII – Fiction - DAYCARE WILL IMPROVE “HUMAN CAPITAL FORMATION” AND MAKE CANADA GLOBALLY COMPETITIVE IN THE NEW “KNOWLEDGE BASED ECONOMY”

Fact: no evidence whatsoever supports this.

VIII - Fiction - QUEBEC HAS A UNIVERSAL HIGH QUALITY DAYCARE SYSTEM

Facts: Daycare in Quebec is neither universal nor high quality.

* A 2005 study of quality in Quebec daycare found : minimal quality 61%, worse than minimal 12%. Low income children were much more likely to be in low quality care.

Quality Counts IRPP Vol 11 #5 Dec 2005 <http://www.irpp.org/choices/archive/vol11no5.pdf>

* The only study of the outcomes for children of the Quebec system states: "*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)

<http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/cepa/childcare.oct2005.final2.pdf> p1,4

* Child:staff ratios have been raised since the data used in the above study was collected: regulations now allow **8 children age 1 per staff**. This would worsen outcomes.

-ECEC 2004 <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pt98/pdf/big.pdf> CHART 15

-ECEC 2001 http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2001/tables_big/TABLE22.pdf

* "*Whereas Quebec set out to create a universal childcare system in 1990s, it is not yet universal because it does not yet provide enough spaces.*" Martha Friendly, top daycare lobbyist, *The Gazette*, June 23 2005, A26

* **Less than 22%** are in the "universal" system: excluding those without a parent who "works or studies," 49.2% of children are in non-parental care, and 45.3% of these are in government-regulated care,

-Jocelyn Tougas, *Reforming Quebec's Early Childhood Care and Education: the First Five Years* – Appendix A p. 74

<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op17/op17ENG.pdf>

-*Low Fee Regulated Childcare...* <http://132.203.59.36/CIRPEE/cahierscirpee/2005/files/CIRPEE05-08.pdf> p34

-Que daycare: "Quality Counts" IRPP Choices Vol 11 no. 5 <http://www.irpp.org/choices/archive/vol11no5.pdf> p10

IX – Fiction: SWEDEN HAS A UNIVERSAL HIGH QUALITY DAYCARE SYSTEM

Fact: Sweden's daycare system is neither universal nor high quality.

*The Swedish Ministry of Education which is responsible for daycare there reports that:

staff: child ratios are not regulated and are excessive. Group size is also too high: for age 1-3: 10-22; for age 3-5: 15-25. (Almost no children under age 1 are in daycare.)

"the preconditions for providing good overall quality have deteriorated, especially as a result of large groups of children and fewer staff" (p26)

"excessive emphasis placed on formal learning at an early stage can have negative consequences."

"sometimes it is apparent that the premises are not appropriate to the current group sizes" (p.22)

"there are great differences...concerning their ability to recruit qualified staff...the situation is most difficult in sparsely populated areas and low resource areas in large cities" (p.22)

- Pre-school in Transition – article and link: <http://www.kidsfirstcanada.org/blog-vol1.htm>

*The OECD praises Sweden for high "productivity" in daycare even as it reports "**a decline in quality**" and "**a problem of quality**".

OECD Country Note Early Childhood Education and Care Policy in Sweden <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/52/31/2534972.pdf> p29, 30

*Including what we call preschool, only 76% children 1-5 are in government-regulated care.
Childcare in Sweden, Fact Sheet http://www.sweden.se/upload/Sweden_se/english/factsheets/SI/SI_FS86k_Childcare_in_Sweden/fs86k.pdf p.2

X - Fiction: DAYCARE WILL LOWER 'CHILD POVERTY' RATES

Facts: DAYCARE IS HURTING LOW INCOME FAMILIES

Funding daycare does not lower "poverty": Lobbyists measure 'poverty' by relative annual household income only. Funding "services" like daycare does not increase this and has not reduced LICO rates. Money for the 'poor' goes to paid service providers, capital costs, lobbyists, administrators and academics.

Increasing direct transfer payments to families, such as the Child Tax Benefit and the National Child Benefit, directly increased income and lowered children's LICO rates.

-Statistics Canada *Perspectives* Autumn 1996

-"Impact of the NCB on the Incomes of Families with Children" http://www.nationalchildbenefit.ca/ncb/impact_analysis/annex1.shtml

Leading daycare lobbyists are not actually interested in eliminating low income: Martha Friendly, Coordinator of the CRRU: "*How do we see Canadian society? In my kids' public schools, there were rich kids and poor kids. Isn't that what we want?*"

"Ottawa Casts Net Wide for Daycare" National Post, Dec 8 2004

***DAYCARE COSTS MORE THAN WELFARE:** Under BC's new funding: for 2 children age 0-18 mos. in daycare centre: a single parent with \$38,000/yr income, gets fee subsidy of \$18,000/yr. The daycare is further subsidized by about \$20,000. True cost to public: over \$38,000. Add Child Tax Benefit: \$43,200. Even high income parents who pay the full fee are subsidized by at least \$26,000 including tax deductions worth about \$6000. Same parent on welfare: \$10,440; including Child Tax Benefit: \$16,140.

- Provincial Child Care Survey 2001 http://www.mcf.gov.bc.ca/childcare/ChildCar/PDFs/Appendix_F.pdf p.2

-BC Gov't public consultation paper: *Building a Better Future for BC's Kids*, p.4, 1999.

- Welfare rates <http://www.eia.gov.bc.ca/mhr/ia.htm>

-BC "Child Care Subsidy Rates" http://www.mcf.gov.bc.ca/childcare/ChildCar/PDFs/rate_table_meia.pdf

Few low-income families and single parents use government-regulated daycare. 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.

-Dr. Francis Woolley, "Taxing Canadian Families" *Policy Options* www.irpp.org/choices/archive/vol6no5.pdf p39

Low income families are not using fee subsidies or licensed care: In 2004 the Child Care Council of BC was concerned that lower income "*Families are not applying for Subsidy*" In BC "moderate-" and "low-income" families are eligible for a fee subsidy. 25 percent of BC children are LICO, yet only 5-6% get this subsidy. "Just over 50 per cent of subsidized children are cared for in license-not-required child care."

-minutes of Prov Child Care Council meeting

-letter to author from BC MSDES 2001

Subsidizing higher-income families with lower-income families' "benefits":

Public money meant for lower-income children through the National Child Benefit is spent on daycare.

- % of NCB for lower-income families spent on gov-regulated child care: http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2001/tables_big/TABLE15.pdf

- % of Early Child Development Initiative fund spent on gov-regulated child care:

http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2001/tables_big/TABLE14.pdf

Funding daycare is done by de-funding families. Total Child Tax Benefit and National Child Benefit expenditures were \$7.7 billion in 2001; this is far less than what would be spent if we still had the \$20/month/child Family Allowance (now worth \$100) AND tax deductions for dependant children of the 1970s. Welfare to families with dependent children had also been reduced: eg in BC parents now become ineligible when youngest child is 3 – down from age 7. In Alberta it is 6 months. This money is transferred to daycare.

-NCB expenditure <http://www.nationalchildbenefit.ca/ncb/govtofcan1.shtml>

Daycare is heavily tax-subsidized even for high income families because fees do not cover full costs. 66% of operating costs alone are covered by gov't in Manitoba. Subsidies include costs of: operation, capital, regulation, inspection, research, promotion, referral services, advertising, training, lobbying, advertising, fees, wages, equipment, administration, rent, repairs, facilities, and land; tax-exemptions for non-profits, charitable tax status, childcare tax deduction, lottery funding; equipment loans.

<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pt98/pdf/big.pdf> table 13 p 108

Spending on “spaces” not on children: The average provincial-only expenditure on government-regulated child care per child for *all* children 0-12 in Canada is \$386, but the expenditure per “space” is: \$3,185. The 90%+ who do not use daycare do not receive any of this.

–ECEC 2001 http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2001/tables_long/TABLE33a_33b.pdf

–ECEC 2001 http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2001/tables_long/TABLE34a_34b.pdf

– ECEC 2004 http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2004/tables_big/TABLE13.pdf

Quebec financed its daycare program by taking funding away from families: The Federal and Provincial Child Tax Benefit as well as monies (up to \$8000) for newborns, etc. were eliminated specifically to fund it. Even wealthy parents pay only \$7/day. For low income families using the program for free, there is a *compulsory* minimum attendance despite the insistence that there is a shortage of spaces. Higher income families are not subject to this coercion.

–J Tougas “Reforming Quebec’s early childhood care and education: The First five Years” <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op17/op17ENG.pdf>

So-called “poverty” reduction programs promote “LABOUR FORCE ATTACHMENT” at the cost of parent-child attachment. The gov’t states that the Nat Child Benefit will
“help prevent and reduce the depth of child poverty;

“promote attachment to the workforce by ensuring that families will always be better off as a result of working”

<http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/benefits/ncb-e.html>

This policy of valuing “labour force attachment” over parent-child attachment coerces mothers into low-pay McJobs. Few primary care-givers - especially single parents - can manage time and energy for a ‘good’ high-paying FT job, and/or job training, while raising children,. Pro-daycare research admits that daycare funding is *“(directly or indirectly) subsidizing low wage employment (‘welfare in work’)*”.

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

MOTHERS’ LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION DOES NOT REDUCE LOW INCOME RATE:

There is no correlation between mothers’ labour force participation rates and reduced low-income rates. Alberta has low LICO, lowest LFP and lowest daycare expenditure. Yet the government says jobs for mothers are the best way out of “poverty”. But forced Labour Force Participation does not mean having a job at all let alone a secure high-paying one. The OECD reports the **income gap** between men and women is **higher** in countries with high rates of Labour Force Participation by women.

-“Women in Employment” <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/53/52/31457987.pdf>

-“Daycare does not lower child poverty or increase mothers’ labour force participation” <http://www.kidsfirstcanada.org/blog-vol4.htm>

XI – Fiction: THE DAYCARE LOBBY IS GRASSROOTS

Facts: Government is lobbying itself through funding the daycare lobby. The daycare lobby is sponsored by and depends on gov’t-funding from HRDC (now SDC), Status of Women (funded by SDC), Health Can., provincial, municipal and university budgets.

* The daycare lobby was awarded \$100 million MORE over 5 yrs in sponsorship from the 2005 Federal Budget <http://www.fin.gc.ca/budget05/bp/bpc4ae.htm#earlylys>

* The SDC-sponsored Childcare Resource and Research Unit at the University of Toronto is HQ for the daycare lobby in Canada and its founder and co-ordinator for over 20 years, Martha Friendly, is the chief architect of

policy. Its massive website states that daycare “lobbying”, “advocacy” or “advancing” daycare(they change the wording on the site) is its core purpose:

“*The Childcare Resource and Research Unit (CRRU) focuses on research and policy resources, **advancing** a universal, high quality, publicly-funded, not-for-profit, inclusive system of early childhood education and care in Canada.*”

-Child Care Research and Resource Unit at the University of Toronto <http://www.childcarecanada.org/about/>

*Fed Gov’t established the Child Care Advocacy Assoc of Can as the Can Day Care Advocacy Assoc in 1983

-R. Mahon, *No Small Matter: Child Policy Research* p15. Can Policy Research Network <http://www.cprn.org/en/doc.cfm?doc=717>

-CBC archives http://archives.cbc.ca/IDC-1-69-1710-11785/life_society/day_care/clip7 DidYou Know?

* The **World Bank** lobbies for more funding to daycare and promotes daycare as part of the “**business imperative**”. The Ontario *Early Years Study* concludes with quoting the World Bank asking for the “combined support of governments, non-government organizations, **the private sector** and the media” but NOT parents in early child development.

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTEDUCATION/EXTECD/0,,menuPK:344945~pagePK:149018~piPK:149093~theSitePK:344939,00.html>

The Early Years Study Fraser Mustard

[http://wwwFOUNDERS.net/ey/home.nsf/a811f0e8afbb2a7985256786003a3dd9/1e4ad2a677be034685256a4700737a3b/\\$FILE/early_years_study.pdf_p182](http://wwwFOUNDERS.net/ey/home.nsf/a811f0e8afbb2a7985256786003a3dd9/1e4ad2a677be034685256a4700737a3b/$FILE/early_years_study.pdf_p182)

Speech to World Bank by RBC Vice President: video <http://www1.worldbank.org/hdnetwork/External/cy/ccoffey.htm>

text: <http://www.rbc.com/newsroom/20050928ccoffey.html> text

* Others calling for preferential funding for daycare are also tax-funded, or run directly by the government. The BC Child Care Advocacy Forum is typical. From their submission to the Federal Finance Ctte: “*Funding and support by: Status of Women Canada BC/Yukon Region through Coalition of Child Care Advocates of BC*” www.cccabc.bc.ca/forum

See also:

-Child Care Advocacy Association of Canada http://www.childcareadvocacy.ca/resources/pdf/ccaac_annualreport04.pdf, p.4

-The Child Care Federation Of Canada http://www.cccf-fcsgc.ca/aboutus/annualreport_en.pdf p.7

-Canadian Council on Social Development <http://www.ccsd.ca/pubs/2003/ar-0304.pdf> p.2

-Canadian Social Policy Research Network www.cprn.com/documents/33894_en.pdf p. 42

-Campaign 2000 <http://www.campaign2000.ca/about/proj.html>

-Coalition of Child Care Advocates of BC www.cccabc.ca

-Westcoast Child Care Resource Centre <http://www.wstcoast.org/>

-(BC) Child Care Advocacy Forum <http://www.cccabc.bc.ca/forum/index.html>

-(BC) Provincial Childcare Council - child care is defined as non-parental care in BC law

<http://www.mcf.gov.bc.ca/childcare/policy.htm>

-Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care <http://www.childcareontario.org/library/annualreport/OCBCCAnnualReport05.pdf> p 4 and 11

-The Caledon Institute <http://www.caledoninst.org/>

-Human Early Learning Partnership at UBC http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/documents/HELP_Crosswalk_Update_07-26-04.doc,

<http://www.msflr.org/sub-partnerships.asp>, <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/26574.html#partners>

* **Through ideological convergence, preferential funding for daycare over non-parental care is sponsored by the left and the corporate right.**

Left: Status of Women*, Caledon Institute*, Campaign 2000*, CCSD*, CPRN*, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, CFL, CAW, CUPE, BCGEU, NDP, Communist Party, etc. (*indicates federal funding)

Right: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development*, the World Bank, *The Economist*, The Royal Bank, RAND Corporation, Liberal Party, Conservative Party, etc.

XII - Fiction: CANADIANS, PARENTS, AND WOMEN ARE DEMANDING A DAYCARE SYSTEM

Facts: Public support for preferentially funding daycare is low

1 – Mothers’ Work Preferences are Ignored

In a poll of 18,000 mothers, 4% said they preferred full-time jobs, 61% preferred part-time, and 29% preferred no paid employment (1996 Parents' Magazine Women and Work poll). Stats Can, which is part of the Ministry

of Industry, has asked similar questions but never published the results. In the Labour Force Survey Stats Can does not ask those in FT jobs if they would prefer PT, but it does ask if PT-ers prefer FT.

-Statistics Canada *Where are the Children? National Child Care Survey*
- Statistics Canada Labour Force Participation Survey questionnaire

2 - Government restricts choice and discriminates in favour of institutional licensed daycare centres. In most provinces *only* government-regulated daycare is subsidized. In BC, unique in Canada, fee subsidies allow parents to choose any non-parental care provider, but BC discriminates by setting different rates for different types of care. In-child's-home care receives the lowest subsidy and group centres receive the highest subsidy. For in-home infant care this could be as low as \$198/month (for a second baby - \$147 for a third) compared to \$618 for the same babies in a licensed center. Subsidy rates for licensed care forms in BC increased by \$33-\$37 while others stayed the same

-Fee subsidy rates: http://www.mcf.gov.bc.ca/childcare/ChildCar/subsidy_promo.htm#rates
-pamphlet: *Child Care Subsidy & Supported Child Care Payments* 1998

3 - BC daycare advocates are alarmed that subsidy-receiving parents are increasingly using non-government-regulated care: 34% chose it in 1992 down to 25% in 1998.

-*Early Childhood Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories*, 1998
-minutes of BC Provincial Child Care Council mtg

4 – **POLLS: Daycare is a “market failure”** (University of Toronto Economists Cleveland and Krashinsky) because it is not preferred, not because of cost “barriers”.

* Polls said to show massive public support (76-90%) for “child care” intentionally do not define “child care” as daycare. The HRDC-funded CPRN researcher explains, “When the question is whether a child-care system *of some sort* [their emphasis] [including “government should pay parents to stay at home with young children”] should be available for all families, a consensus emerges.”

“Press Release: Values and Preferences for the ‘Best Policy Mix’ for Canadian Children” <http://www.cprn.org/en/doc.cfm?doc=794>

*2000 Compass poll for National Foundation for Family Research and Education (Canadian): “Should government give money to daycare so that it costs less, or should government give money to parents so that parents can better afford whatever care they themselves decide is best for their own children?” 79% said parents, up 10% since 1997, and 21% said daycare.

* 2004 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 . 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

*1997 Compass poll: Ideally, is it best for an infant or preschool child to be cared for during the day by his or her parent (92%) or in an institutional daycare setting (9%)?

*2000 Public Agenda poll: The “overwhelming majority” agreed that “the love and sustained attention a parent provides simply cannot be replicated by other forms of care.”

*1997 Wirthlin Worldwide poll: an “overwhelming majority” rated “care by a child's own mother” as the most desirable form of child care. Of the 9 options available “care by a child's grandmother, aunt or other family member” was second, “care by a government daycare centre” was least desirable, and second to last was “care by a commercial daycare centre.”

XIII – Fiction: UNIVERSAL QUALITY DAYCARE WILL COST ONLY 1 PER CENT OF GDP

Fact: either its not universal, or it costs well over \$50 billion, or we drop all ‘high quality’ pretenses

1 - Universal daycare is not universal: Quebec’s “universal” program serves only 22.3% of children 0-12 whose parents “work or study” at an average cost of \$4,651 per “space”. Quebec has “spaces” for only 21.1 %

of children All the others children are in un-funded “child care spaces” – mostly at home. Daycare advocates rely on the vast majority of parents to look after their own children without any public financial support and to pay for daycare for the small minority who want it .

-derived from J.Tougas report: <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op17/op17ENG.pdf> p74

-ECEC 2001 http://www.childcarecanada.org/ECEC2001/tables_long/TABLE30.pdf

2 - 24/7/365: To fulfill the promise of universality, it is recommended daycares be always open.

-*Pay the Rent or Feed the Kids*, Mel Hurtig

3 - Long-term care: To fulfill the promise of career/social/political equality for mothers/parents, daycares would also have take children for extended periods while parents were realizing equality with non-parents.

4 - Sick-child care: To fulfill promises, children could not be excluded from daycare because of illness.

5 – Sweden runs its high-enrollment system by resorting to unacceptable child:staff ratios and too-large groups: **10-22 children age 1-3** according to Swedish government report. Yet the OECD says Sweden shows “respect for children”.

-*Pre-School in Transition 2004* link at <http://www.kidsfirstcanada.org/blog-vol1.htm>

6- Dollar costs are rarely mentioned or grossly underestimated: “I don't have a dollar figure,” says daycare advocate, Dr. Hillel Goelman (The Province). Others say “1% of GDP—about \$10 billion per year” (Sharon Gregson, CKNW interview). Yet there are many estimates, none of which consider 24/7/365, long-term, or sick-child care, or the massive regulatory/bureaucratic overhead:

***\$15,700/yr/space: Quebec** non-profit centres for infant care, \$11,500/yr age 18-59 mos. Excludes cost of bureaucracy, training, capital, etc.

Low Fee Regulated Childcare Policy CIRPEE <http://132.203.59.36/CIRPEE/cahierscirpee/2005/files/CIRPEE05-08.pdf> p22 footnote

*A study of centre-based care in the US military of operating costs found *excluding* capital costs, rent, and larger repairs, the actual 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.

RAND Foundation <http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1415/MR1415.chap4.pdf>

*“True Cost of Care”:1999 - operating costs only: \$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

-BC Gov't public consultation discussion paper: *Building a Better Future for BC's Kids*, p.4, 1999

*\$8,500/yr per 2-5 yr olds, operating costs only, *excluding* capital, regulatory, training, etc. costs.

-*The Benefits & Costs of Good Child Care* Cleveland & Krashinski <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/other/benefits/bc.pdf> p56

*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. -NY Times July 7, 2003

7 - The more reliable RAND data indicates a costs of well over **\$50 billion** for limited (not 24/7/365) universal licensed daycare for the over 5 million children 0-12 in Canada, or \$10,000 per child. For high quality and wages it could be \$100 billion.

XIV- Fiction: BREASTFEEDING FOR 6 MONTHS IS RECOMMENDED

Fact: **WHO recommends at least 2 years of breastfeeding.** But our governments misinform and do not give women their right to accurate information. See *Growing Up in Canada* by Statistics Canada on breastfeeding.

-WHO “Global Strategy for Infant & Young Child Feeding” http://www.who.int/nut/documents/gi_infant_feeding_text_eng.pdf

IDEOLOGIES & AGENDAS: STRATEGIES

The campaign of misinformation, and the funding policies which fuel it, flow from these strategies. NOTE: THE FOLLOWING QUOTES ARE FROM GOV'T-FUNDED “RESEARCH” unless otherwise noted

I – MANIPULATING POLITICAL WILL AND SOCIETAL ATTITUDES

* *“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 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”

—quoted in “The OECD and the Reconciliation Agenda: Competing Blueprints,” R. Mahon <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op20/op20.pdf> p9

* *“Making significant changes to social attitudes is a complex and challenging task. With strong constituencies favouring conservative family policies, it is not surprising that the issues are of garnering political will that inevitably involves conflict. To garner that political will, we will also need a wide range of creative strategies such as influencing the media, developing allies, enhancing the reputation of child care with allied professionals and fostering public education.”*

“Recruitment and Retention of Early Childhood Educators & Caregivers: The Policy Factor” (removed from CRRU web as of Fall 2005)

* *“In Canada...conservative family values are very popular....Attempts to change this attitude have been partially successful....[however] this societal attitude remains strong and wide spread. Changing such attitudes is possible, but the challenge is a formidable”*

-“Babysitters or Professionals? The Role of Societal Attitudes in the Retention and Recruitment of Child Care Workers” <http://home.istar.ca/%7Eeccns/RR/DP/C.pdf> pp.3-4 (not at this site as of Fall 2005)

* The societal “resistance” is due to not just to ‘conservative values’, but also to *“liberal ideology [which] believes in individual choice and individual responsibility. This means that liberal thinking governments refrain as much as possible from...government intervention.”*

-“Recruitment and Retention of Early Childhood Educators & Care givers: The Policy Factor” <http://home.istar.ca/%7Eeccns/RR/DP/D.pdf> pp.4, 2

*Problematic *“societal attitudes”* are the *“Privatization of the Family: Early childhood care being perceived as a replacement for ‘mother care’, leads to the second identified societal attitude: the assumption that raising children is a private family affair.... [and] that society idealizes motherhood”*

-Retention and Recruitment Project www.istar.ca/%7Eeccns/rrreport.html (no longer at this site – author’s copy)

* *“Canadians 'are breaking from the notion of children as a private responsibility towards the notion of children as a more shared social responsibility.”*

-Judith Maxwell, CPRN President commenting on their 1998 poll, *Toronto Star*

**“We were required to attend the childcare advocacy workshop, and do a report on it for our course. They kept telling us, ‘You don’t have to know the facts to be an advocate’. Sharon [Gregson, Child Care Advocacy Coalition] started off by telling us she has 4 kids and she put them in daycare when they were only 7 weeks old, because parents aren’t as good at child care as ECE experts. That’s not what I believe at all, I was appalled.”*

-EV, BC mother, licensed daycare owner and ECE student, May 2004, conversation with author

II - REJECTION OF DEVELOPMENTAL SCIENCE : The European Commission and other top international and Canadian policy architects explicitly reject empirical evidence, attachment theory and developmental science:

* *“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>

*This comes to Canada via the CRRU at the U of T which is the government’s chief advisory body on children’s care which cites the European Commission in its policy Briefs:

“quality is a relative concept, based on values and beliefs”

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

*Attachment theory is specifically attacked:

“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>

“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 work of Fraser Mustard is cited.

“The OECD and the Reconciliation Agenda: Competing Blueprints,” R. Mahon <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op20/op20.pdf> p4

*Experimenting with babies and toddlers: New unfounded theories rejecting attachment theory provide the needed rationale for high numbers of small children per staff. Peer-attachment and independence from adults in the very young is emphasized:

“[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>

*Findings from huge peer-reviewed studies such as the US NICHD research and Ad Health studies are attacked, misrepresented or completely ignored. Findings from developmental science that show harms of poor care (eg Romanian orphans, rats and monkeys deprived of maternal care) are perversely said to provide “mountains of evidence” for preferentially funding daycare (eg. Fraser Mustard, *The Early Years Project: Reversing the Real Brain Drain*).

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

“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.

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

III – DISCRIMINATION IN LEGISLATION :Duplicitous definitions of “child care” and “work”

The term “daycare” is now avoided by the lobby. They often say “child care” but the meaning of that depends on the context. In the studies used to prove that we use or want or benefit from full time daycare centre care from age 0-12 for all it does not actually mean ‘daycare.’ It may mean “non-maternal care” or as anything other

than exclusive full time maternal care, including care by mother while she does paid work, father care, grandparent care, or as participation in any programme at all including mother-baby drop-ins and preschool.

BUT definitions used to determine funding exclude parental care and preferentially treat daycare centre care.

***Early Learning and Child Care Agreements in Principle** between the Fed gov and Alb, Ont, Sask, Man, NS, and Newf/Lab define this term to exclude funding all but gov-regulated daycare and preschools.

-http://www.sdc.gc.ca/en/cs/comm/sd/news/agreements_principle/index.shtml

****“Child care” defined in BC law:** “the care and supervision of a child other than by (a) the child's parents”.

-BC Benefits - Child Care - Act, definitions <http://www.mhr.gov.bc.ca/PUBLICAT/VOL1/Part3/3-6.htm>

***Revenue Canada:** “child care” means receipted non-parental care for 2-income or single parent families only.

***Child & Spousal Support Legislation:** if daycare is used, payments are higher because it is considered a “special expense” - parental care is not. Low amounts: \$343/month for 1 child for payer with \$40,000/yr income; \$761 at \$100,000/yr. No increases since 1997. This worsens low income for single parents.

There are no equivalent subsidies for families who look after their own children. Canada is the only western industrialized nation with no universal benefit for all families with dependent children. The long-standing deductions and “baby-bonus” was eliminated under Mulroney in 1993.

IV – DISCRIMINATION IN LANGUAGE

Positive terms used to promote daycare: good, nurturing, developmental, high quality, stimulating, sensitive & responsive, training, qualified, accountable, regulated, care-giver (not ‘care-seller’), inclusive, developmental, social, educational, learning, professional, educational environment.

Negative terms used to slander non-daycare care: illegal, informal, mishmash, patchwork, of low quality, of unknown quality, unregulated, incoherent, mere babysitting, mere custodial care. We are told only “fortunate”, “lucky” privileged families with “white picket fences” can “afford” the choice to have “a stay at home mum”.

IDEOLOGIES & AGENDAS – GOALS

NOTE: ALL QUOTES ARE FROM GOV’T-FUNDED “RESEARCH” unless otherwise noted.

1 - “SHARED RESPONSIBILITY”

One goal is to reduce parents’ control of child rearing and increase intervention of the state and its allies:

A HRDC-funded papers on an HRDC-funded daycare website www.childcarecanada.org make it clear that:

* the *“ideology of the family” is a problem and must be replaced by “a new order. This includes deep changes in societies in general and in the family’s structure in particular...a review of the family-state relationship regarding the responsibility for the care and education of children.”*

“the paradigm shift from an exclusively family responsibility to a shared responsibility, which is the legitimization of out-of-home child socialization. This means a significant portion of the upbringing process has now becomes a public concern and calls for: a redefinition of public (state) and private (family) relationships concerning children’s affairs”

“Although there is a growing view of ECEC as a shared responsibility between the family and the state, in many countries the state is still reluctant to intervene in the family domain, especially when it comes to investments for under-threes and full-time coverage.”

-“An Integrated Approach to Early Childhood Education and Care: A Preliminary Study”<http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op16/op16.pdf>, p. 3,6,9

2 - “LABOUR FORCE ATTACHMENT” & CARE AS COMMODITY

The second goal is GDP and corporate profit expansion; it is not about “social justice”, it is not “left

wing". Child-rearing is still largely uncommodified, given not sold. Commodification means non-parental control, profits, tax revenue and GDP enlargement.

*Dr. Micheal Krashinski, leading daycare economist at University of Toronto clarifies this goal:

"Capitalism is and always has been brutal.... Whenever there has been change, people have been ground up. People like stability, so to get them to leave a dying industry or whatever, you have to burn them.... [By way of analogy, farmers] had to be hammered before they'd get off the land, had to really be hurt."

"The old labour-intensive way of caring for children...is no longer viable."

-"Brave New Workplace", The Toronto Star, 24 April 1993

-*The Benefits & Costs of Good Child Care* Cleveland & Krashinski <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/other/benefits/bc.pdf> p67

* **"POST-MATERNALISM"** is the name for the OECD-generated policies under which funding for families has been cut and shifted to funding for daycare. The intent is to promote **"a greater role for the state"** and **"interventions earlier in life"** by **"redefin[ing] equity"** so as to create more **"flexible labour markets"** and **"(directly or indirectly) subsidizing low wage employment ('welfare in work')"**.

"The OECD and the Reconciliation Agenda: Competing Blueprints," R. Mahon <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op20/op20.pdf> p9-11

* The **World Bank** lobbies for more funding to daycare and promotes daycare as part of the **"business imperative"**. The Ontario Early Years Study concludes with quoting the World Bank asking for the "combined support of governments, non-government organizations, **the private sector** and the media" but NOT parents in early child development.

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTEDUCATION/EXTECD/0,,menuPK:344945~pagePK:149018~piPK:149093~theSitePK:344939,00.html>

The Early Years Study Fraser Mustard

[http://wwwFOUNDERS.net/ey/home.nsf/a811f0e8afbb2a7985256786003a3dd9/1e4ad2a677be034685256a4700737a3b/\\$FILE/early_years_study.pdf_p182](http://wwwFOUNDERS.net/ey/home.nsf/a811f0e8afbb2a7985256786003a3dd9/1e4ad2a677be034685256a4700737a3b/$FILE/early_years_study.pdf_p182)

Speech to World Bank by RBC Vice President: video <http://www1.worldbank.org/hdnetwork/External/cy/ccoffey.htm>

text: <http://www.rbc.com/newsroom/20050928coffey.html> text

*Ideologues in Canada and the OECD call for commodification in **"professionalization of care"**.

-*An Integrated Approach to Early Childhood Education and Care: A Preliminary Study* <http://www.childcarecanada.org/pubs/op16/op16.pdf> p6

"Our economy depends on women working and paying taxes"

-Sharon Gregson, SFU daycare administrator, CBC Commentary, Jan. 2003

*The OECD advises **"Putting More Women to Work"** through low child benefits, short maternity leaves, low welfare benefits, and calls mothers **"inactive"** who work entirely outside GDP sectors.

-"Putting More Women to Work: A Colloquium on Employ't, Child Care & Taxes"

http://www.oecd.org/document/56/0,2340,en_2649_37457_31687864_1_1_1_37457,00.html

-"Women in Employment" <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/53/52/31457987.pdf>

* **"If the supply of regulated day care spaces is indeed a concern, advocates should be promoting a greater role for the private sector"** says corporate right think tank, **Fraser Institute**. They say this despite their admission that there is no supply shortage. Like the left, they do not advocate funding families equitably.

-"Private Sector Can Meet Child Care Demands" Peter Shawn Taylor, *Fraser Forum March 2004 Families and the State*

<http://www.fraserinstitute.ca/shared/readmore.asp?sNav=pb&id=642>

-*Caring for Kids – Child Care Choices Fraser Forum* May 2005 <http://www.fraserinstitute.ca/admin/books/chapterfiles/May05ff.pdf>

Corporate profits will increase, as will union and tax revenue:

*as care becomes a commodity, sold for money rather than done out of love and duty

*when wages are depressed by swollen "labour force" as parents are coerced into seeking more paid work

*when wages are depressed as the state-funded daycare acts as a wage-subsidy

*as US daycare "big box" corporations provide "spaces" paid for by taxes. Under NAFTA US firms are equally eligible for these funds, and have expressed interest according to the "non-profit" faction of the daycare lobby.

-"The Tiny Tot Brigade" *Toronto Star* April 24, 2005

*as families buy more goods & services they once produced themselves: fast food, entertainment, lessons, care