

## Archived Content

Information identified as archived on the Web is for reference, research or record-keeping purposes. It has not been altered or updated after the date of archiving. Web pages that are archived on the Web are not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards.

As per the [Communications Policy of the Government of Canada](#), you can request alternate formats on the "[Contact Us](#)" page.

## Information archivée dans le Web

Information archivée dans le Web à des fins de consultation, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Cette dernière n'a aucunement été modifiée ni mise à jour depuis sa date de mise en archive. Les pages archivées dans le Web ne sont pas assujetties aux normes qui s'appliquent aux sites Web du gouvernement du Canada.

Conformément à la [Politique de communication du gouvernement du Canada](#), vous pouvez demander de recevoir cette information dans tout autre format de rechange à la page « [Contactez-nous](#) ».

EXERCISE/EXERCICE NEW HORIZONS

**An Opportunity to Lead the Way: The Requirement for Equitable Access to Quality,  
Affordable Child Care Throughout the Canadian Forces**

By /par Major Brigid W. Dooley-Tremblay

19 April 2001

*“[C]hild care is an important readiness and retention issue for military families: readiness because single parents and dual service couples must have access to affordable and quality child care if they are to perform their jobs...; retention because family dissatisfaction with military life – and particularly the inability of many spouses to establish careers or obtain suitable employment – is a primary reason trained military personnel leave the military.”*

*-Summary Report of the  
US House of Representatives  
Armed Services Committee Proceedings  
Nos 101-121 (1989)\**

*This paper was written by a student attending the Canadian Forces College in fulfilment of one of the requirements of the Course of Studies. The paper is a scholastic document, and thus contains facts and opinions which the author alone considered appropriate and correct for the subject. It does not necessarily reflect the policy or the opinion of any agency, including the Government of Canada and the Canadian Department of National Defence. This paper may not be released, quoted or copied except with the express permission of the Canadian Department of National Defence.*

*La présente étude a été rédigée par un stagiaire du Collège des Forces canadiennes pour satisfaire à l'une des exigences du cours. L'étude est un document qui se rapporte au cours et contient donc des faits et des opinions que seul l'auteur considère appropriés et convenables au sujet. Elle ne reflète pas nécessairement la politique ou l'opinion d'un organisme quelconque, y compris le gouvernement du Canada et le ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada. Il est défendu de diffuser, de citer ou de reproduire cette étude sans la permission expresse du ministère de la Défense nationale.*

---

\*Cited in: Nancy Campbell, et al, *Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation's Child Care System* (Washington: The National Women's Law Centre, April 2000), p. 8.

## INTRODUCTION

The 1999 Senate Committee on National Defence and Veteran's Affairs (SCONDVA) Report on quality of life (QOL) in the Canadian Forces (CF) highlighted numerous factors affecting recruiting, retention, readiness and the QOL of CF members and their families. Childcare was key among them, for a variety of reasons.<sup>i</sup>

First, Canada is experiencing a “national childcare crisis.”<sup>ii</sup> Sufficient childcare is not available to meet the needs of Canadians and an enormous discrepancy exists in its availability, cost and quality across the country.<sup>iii</sup> This directly affects the QOL of military families as they are posted from province to province.

Second, over half of all CF members have children.<sup>iv</sup> (Refer to **Annex A**). Military families tend to live in military communities where there is a greater concentration of children than within the general population.<sup>v</sup> Service members are posted regularly and liable to be deployed on operations on short notice. Due to the conditions of service, they often work irregular hours and live away from extended family that might otherwise be available to provide childcare.<sup>vi</sup> Accordingly, lack of access to quality, affordable childcare arguably has a greater impact on military families than it does on the average Canadian family.

Third, childcare is important. Numerous studies have demonstrated the negative impact that poor quality childcare has on children, their families and society. In contrast, high quality childcare has significant, long-term, positive effects.<sup>vii</sup> Yet, because of the national shortage of regulated<sup>†</sup> childcare spaces and the high cost of quality care, most children are placed in unregulated, in-home care arrangements of unknown standard.<sup>viii</sup> This causes stress for families who are often uncertain whether their children are being provided with the quality “head

---

<sup>†</sup> Regulated childcare is defined as: “...childcare that is provided in a licensed daycare facility or in a home that is licensed by the province or territory or by a provincial or territorial licensed agency.” DND/CF (Human Resources - Military Family Services), *Deployment and Emergency Childcare Service* (Ottawa: DND,

---

n.d.) [[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/cfpa/dmfs/Engraph/child\\_e.asp](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/cfpa/dmfs/Engraph/child_e.asp)]. Therefore, an unregulated childcare provider is one that is unlicensed and, therefore, not required to abide by the standards that pertain to licensed facilities including safety and health standards.

start” that they deserve.

Fourth, both the *SCONDVA Report* and *Defence Planning Guidance (DPG) 2001* emphasize that the CF must become an employer of choice if it wishes to attract the “best and brightest” into its ranks.<sup>ix</sup> A review of the web pages of large, North American companies shows that company-subsidized childcare programs feature prominently in the human resources strategy of many.<sup>x</sup> If the CF wishes to become an employer of choice, it must follow suit.

Fifth, the challenges of juggling family and work are becoming more acute as an increasing number of women and single parents enter the workplace; and lack of access to affordable, quality childcare is widely recognized as a barrier to these groups seeking and retaining employment.<sup>‡ xi</sup> To place this in context, forty-five per cent of service women have children.<sup>xii</sup> In 1996, a single parent headed one in thirteen CF families, approximately double the rate of the general population.<sup>xiii</sup> Moreover, the fact that seventy-eight percent of military single parents are male means that childcare is not a “female problem” within the CF.<sup>xiv</sup> A 1998 Land Force Western Area (LFWA) study indicated that childcare difficulties are expected to interfere with the ability of many service personnel to deploy, including over fifty percent of single parents and married service couples (MSC) with children.<sup>xv</sup> Given such statistics, childcare should be a concern for the CF, particularly if it wishes to enhance levels of readiness and to attract and retain women, MSC and single service members.

Many of the childcare problems faced by CF personnel are shared by other Canadians. Given the specific challenges with which military families contend, however, the impact of the national childcare crisis is magnified within the CF. The US military, faced with a similar situation over a decade ago, now runs the “*largest employer-sponsored childcare program in the*

---

<sup>‡</sup> This phenomenon is widely discussed in the literature (see endnote 11). With regard to the CF, a 1996 survey found that many military personnel are having difficulty juggling family and work: “48% of military members...said they disagreed with the statement ‘the Department recognized the need to balance family and



[US]....” which is upheld as a national model.<sup>xvi</sup> If the CF is serious about improving recruiting, retention and readiness, enhancing the QOL of its members and becoming an employer of choice, it must also develop a child care system that provides equitable access to quality, affordable childcare wherever military personnel serve.

### WHY CHILDCARE IS IMPORTANT FOR CHILDREN, FAMILIES AND SOCIETY

The reasons that quality childcare is important to children, their families and society need to be understood. Childcare should also be a military concern for many of the same reasons, which are outlined below.

First, research has shown that children who have access to quality, early childhood education, experience quicker intellectual development and succeed better in school and in later life. This is true regardless of the economic status of their parents and whether or not one parent remains at home. In contrast, individuals who are the products of poor-quality early childcare are more likely to have higher long-term delinquency rates and lower levels of economic success throughout their lives.<sup>xvii</sup> A recent economic study found that, for every dollar invested in quality childcare, society reaps a two dollar benefit in terms of reduced levels of investment in social programs, including healthcare, and a greater return in tax dollars due to increased lifetime earnings.<sup>xviii</sup> As a basic QOL issue, therefore, the CF is ethically bound to ensure that the children of military personnel are not being placed at a long-term educational, social and economic disadvantage due to lack of access to quality childcare.

Second, “*good health and development during early childhood are among the most important factors in making sure that people grow up healthy enough to learn, find work, raise families of their own and participate fully in society for the rest of their lives.*”<sup>xix</sup> Health Canada, includes “*child development*” and “*social support*” (including “*community support*”) as

two of twelve key determinants of population health.<sup>xx</sup> Families that have access to community support

in the form of quality, affordable childcare are more likely to “thrive” than those that raise children without such support.<sup>xxi</sup> Given the particularly stressful nature of the military lifestyle, the CF has a responsibility to ensure that service families are provided with the childcare assistance that they require to thrive.

Third, parents who have access to quality, affordable childcare suffer decreased levels of stress, tend to be healthier and are more productive in the workplace.<sup>xxii</sup> They generally take less time off work to deal with family-related problems.<sup>§ xxiii</sup> Those with flexible childcare arrangements are better able to respond to irregular work hours and other unusual work-related requirements. These facts should be of interest to the CF in its efforts to boost productivity, foster retention and maintain high readiness levels in a shrinking force.<sup>xxiv</sup>

Fourth, access to affordable, quality childcare is good for society. Not only does it provide long-term economic, social and health-cost benefits, but it provides children from all social and economic classes with an equal “head start” thereby helping to combat the poverty cycle.<sup>xxv</sup> It also permits their parents to participate in training programs, enabling them to build careers. Affordable, quality childcare is particularly important for women and immigrants who,

---

<sup>§</sup> Catherine Lee, *Needs Analysis Report on Workplace Daycare Centre(s) and Information and Referral Services for Child and Elder Care* (Ottawa: Directorate of Civilian Human Resource Planning (DCHRP), 21 July 1993) cited the figures in Table A which describe the amount of time DND personnel working in the National Capital Region take from work to deal with childcare-related issues. They suggest that childcare concerns are having an impact upon absentee rates within the DND.

**Table A: Absence from Work For Childcare Reasons – NCR (1993)**

<b>In the past year.....</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>
Left work suddenly because your childcare arrangements broke down	50%	50%
Lost a full day work because child was ill	40.55%	59.65%
Left work suddenly because your child was ill	44.4%	55.56%
Late for work because your child was ill	53.88%	46.12%



while better educated than the national average, \*\* are marginalised in Canadian society due to

---

\*\* Table B: Highest Level of Education: Men and Women aged 25-44 (1996)

	university without degree	university with BA or professional degree	university with advanced degree
<b>Immigrant Women</b>	12.4	15.4	6.5
<b>Canadian Women</b>	10.6	13.3	4.2
<b>Immigrant Men</b>	13.0	16.1	9.1
<b>Canadian Men</b>	9.6	12.4	4.2

Source: Government of Canada (Statistics Canada), *Women in Canada 2000* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2000), pp. 213-214.

lack of access to high paying jobs.<sup>††xxvi</sup> The CF remains one of the few institutions that continues

to offer a long-term stable career. Were childcare to become a cornerstone of the CF’s human resources (HR) policy, it might better enable the CF to attract and retain “visible minorities,” including women, which it publicly states it wishes to recruit into its ranks. At present, it is unable to do so effectively in part because of the social barriers imposed by the “national childcare crisis.”

### THE NATIONAL CHILDCARE “CRISIS” – WHAT CRISIS?

*“Childcare is severely compromised on three fronts: the availability of spaces to meet the needs of children and their families, the affordability of care and the quality of services provided.”<sup>xxvii</sup>*  
-National Council of Welfare

For at least thirty years, the Canadian Government has formally recognized that a national childcare crisis exists. The 1970 *Royal Commission on the Status of Women* was the first official report to recommend the development of a national childcare program.<sup>xxviii</sup> Over the years, successive federal governments have announced efforts to improve support to childcare. Few have done much to increase the number of regulated childcare spaces or to improve their quality and reduce their cost.<sup>xxix</sup>

The main challenges to resolving the crisis remain accessibility, quality and affordability. These are difficult matters to address for two reasons. First, childcare falls under the purview of the provinces and childcare policies vary greatly across the nation. Second, childcare is largely

†† Table C: Unemployment Rates: Men and Women Aged 25-44 (1996)

	university without degree	university with degree
Immigrant Women	11.2	9.1
Canadian Women	6.2	4.4
Immigrant Men	10.1	7.7
Canadian Men	6.8	3.6

Source: Government of Canada (Statistics Canada), *Women in Canada 2000* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2000). p. 213 - 214.

provided by the private sector in a variety of formats: regulated daycare, regulated in-home care and unregulated in-home care.<sup>‡‡</sup> (**Annex B** breaks down the availability of childcare across Canada by type and province.) The “system” that has evolved, based on supply and demand, is characterized by enormous disparities in the availability, cost and quality of childcare between and within provinces.<sup>xxx</sup> These elements are also at the crux of the challenges facing military families.

Accessibility. Despite the demonstrable benefits of quality childcare, it is still not available to many Canadian families. It is estimated that, at some point in their lives, over fifty percent of all Canadian children will require childcare.<sup>xxx</sup> This figure includes full and part-time care as well as before and after school care.<sup>§§</sup> It may be higher for children of military personnel given the demographics of the CF and the inherently unstable nature of the military lifestyle.

Only ten percent of Canadian children are cared for in regulated facilities including childcare centres and registered homes.<sup>xxxii</sup> All other children requiring care are looked after in private homes which are not required to meet provincial health and safety standards and where the care provided is generally lower in quality than that provided in regulated homes.<sup>xxxiii</sup> Given the potential negative effects of poor-quality early childcare, “custodial quality” childcare is not an acceptable solution. Unfortunately, parents are forced to rely upon unregulated childcare because there are insufficient regulated spaces to meet demand.<sup>xxxiv</sup> As any CF parent will tell you, many shortages exist on CF bases.

---

<sup>‡‡</sup> In this paper, “in home care” refers to two separate types of childcare arrangements. The first is care that is provided in the child’s home that is technically referred to as “in-home care.” This includes care by relatives, neighbors, friends, nannies and au pairs. It is usually unregulated. The second form of care is that provided in a caregiver’s home which is formally called “family child care.” Beach and Bertrand, *More Than the Sum of the Parts: An Early Childhood Development System for Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto, October 2000), p. 27. Eight point eight percent (8.8%) of all Family Child Care homes are regulated. The remainder are not. For the purposes of this paper, both types of home-based arrangements are referred to as “in home care.” Gillian Doherty et al, *You Bet I Care (Vol III)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Regulated Family Child Care Across Canada*, (Guelph, Ont: University of Guelph, 2000), p. 23.

The *1988 National Childcare Study* broke down childcare arrangements across the nation as described in **Figure 1** below. It may be assumed that CF childcare patterns follow a similar trend, although access to regulated care may be even a greater problem given the high concentration of children in military communities.

---

<sup>88</sup> Children in full-time care require childcare for more than half a day (usually for three or more days a week.) Children in part-time care are those who require childcare for half a day or less one or more times a week. "Before and after school care is care provided to children attending elementary school during the hours before and after school, on school holidays, and during summer months." US Air Force Instruction 34-276, *Family Childcare Programs*. 1 November 1999.

**Figure 1: National Childcare Arrangements by Type (1988)<sup>xxxv</sup>**

	Spouse	Childcare Centre	Relative	Non-Relative (1)	Self/Sibling	Other (2)
<b>Children 0-5</b>	18.3%	17.4%	18.7%	32.9%	0%	12.7%
<b>Children 6-12</b>	26.6%	4.0%	10.5%	14.2%	21.2%	23.5%

Notes: (1) includes regulated and unregulated in-home care

(2) includes "off-scheduling" of work (see footnotes for definition), reliance on recreation programs and before/after school programs

All children under the age of six require full-time care of some description while children under the age of 12 generally require care before and after school.<sup>\*\*\*xxxvi</sup> As **Figure 2** below shows,

CF members have a total of 39,383 children aged twelve and under. If the national percentages are employed, over 20,000 of them will require access to regulated full or part-time childcare at some point in time. The statistics provided at **Figure 1** make it clear that this requirement is not being met by regulated childcare services located on CF bases and in military communities.<sup>†††</sup>

**Figure 2: Number of Children Aged 12 and Under in CF Families<sup>xxxvii</sup>**

	Married		MSC		Single		Common Law	
	Child 0-5	Child 6-12	Child 0-5	Child 6-12	Child 0-5	Child 6-12	Child 0-5	Child 6-12
<b>Male</b>	10,194	18,180	742	1041	753	2,062	2111	2174
<b>Female</b>	333	549	713	978	215	517	225	287
<b>CF Total</b>	10,527	18,729	1,455 (742)*	2,019 (1041)*	968	2,579	2,336	2,461
<b>Total children 0-5</b>	14,573		<b>Total children 6-12</b>		24,810	<b>Total Children</b>		39,383

\*The "male" figures for MSC were used in calculating the totals to ensure that the children of MSC were not counted twice.

The 1988 National Child Care Study noted that 16.6% of all parents make arrangements to "off-schedule"<sup>†††</sup> work to enable them to share responsibility for childcare.<sup>xxxviii</sup> It is reasonable to assume that, when feasible, military families do likewise to enable spouses to

\*\*\*A small percentage of children across the country require "special needs" care. It would be reasonable to assume that a similar percentage of children of military families also require special care. No specific statistics are available regarding the percentage of special needs kids requiring childcare. Gillian Doherty et al, *You Bet I Care (Vol III): Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Child Care Centres Across Canada*, Op.Cit., p. 121-122 notes, however, that three-quarters of all childcare centres reported having one special needs child while one in eight reported having five or more. It is difficult to measure "special needs" because the term can refer to many different things. Nonetheless, child care for "special needs" children is one area that the CF must be prepared to address in any childcare system that it may develop, particularly in those regions where early childhood education (ECE) for special needs kids is not readily available.

††† Not all bases offer full-time childcare. For example, several such as Meaford, Greenwood and Halifax offer casual, drop-in care only. See the Military Family Services Web Page [[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/cfpa/dmfs/engraph/ptel\\_e.asp](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/cfpa/dmfs/engraph/ptel_e.asp)]. No central statistics are available on the number of full-time regulated spaces sponsored by the CF across the country. Even assuming, however, that every major CF base were to offer 50 regulated spaces (many that have full-time regulated care average between 40 and 60) the CF would still only provide less than 1,000 regulated childcare spaces. This falls far short of any realistic estimated requirement.

††† "Off-schedule" means that parents make work arrangements so that one of them is home to provide childcare when it is required (or for at least most of the period during which childcare is required). Many families use this as a means of coping with childcare requirements. Such arrangements break down in a military context,

work. Such arrangements are stressful on families and are not available at all to MSC and single parents.

Many CF families are, therefore, faced with the challenge of finding either part-time or full-time childcare that is flexible enough to meet their requirements on an ongoing basis in a market that is not responsive to their needs.

Several reports, including the SCONDVA Report, emphasize the childcare challenges faced by MSC and single parents. Emergency childcare, childcare during absences and childcare during irregular hours pose particular problems. The potential impact that lack of access to flexible, quality childcare might have on the CF in terms of readiness and the QOL of its members becomes apparent from the statistics depicted in **Figure 3** below:

**Figure 3: Percentage of Military Personnel with Children by Gender and Marital Status**<sup>xxxix</sup>

	Male	Female	Total	Total as a % of	
				CF Parents	CF Members
<b>Single with Children</b>	2546	702	3248	10	<b>5.65</b>
<b>Married with Children</b>	22,539	687	23,226	71.55	<b>40.43</b>
<b>MSC with Children</b>	1192	1186	2,378	7.32	<b>4.14</b>
<b>Common Law with Children</b>	3217	393	3,610	11.1	<b>6.28</b>
<b>Total CF With Children</b>	<b>29,494</b>	<b>2,968</b>	<b>32,462</b>	100%	<b>56.51%</b>
<b>Total CF</b>	50,881	6,559	57,440	---	---

The 1998 LFWA study attempted to measure the potential impact that childcare arrangements might have on Army readiness in western Canada. The results are summarized in **Figure 4** below. While the survey was limited in its geographic scope and test population, it can be assumed that its findings apply generally throughout the CF. The study noted that soldiers rely most heavily on spouses, family and friends to provide primary care for their children both in garrison (59.9%) and when deployed (84%)<sup>§§§</sup>, a difficult situation particularly for single

---

<sup>§§§</sup> Primary care refers to the key person or agency (guardian) responsible 24 hours a day for the child's well being. Children may also spend much of their time in secondary childcare arrangements such as when a primary caregiver is at work. National statistics show that the majority of families rely on unregulated care for secondary childcare. (Endnote 32 refers). With regard to primary childcare, the LFWA study provided the following statistics:  
Primary care – garrison: spouse 59.9%, relative/friend 8.3%, unlicensed childcare 8.9%, licensed daycare 7.2%, licensed agency 8.8%, other 6.9%  
Primary care - long deployment: spouse 84%, relative/friend 6.6%, unlicensed childcare 1.2%, licensed daycare 2.2%, licensed agency 1.5%, other 1.6%, no plan 2.8%  
Primary care – emergency operation: spouse 83.1%, relative/friend 6.7%, unlicensed childcare 2.3%, licensed childcare 2.3%, licensed agency 1.2%, other 1.3%, no plan 2.9%  
Primary care – courses, exercises, TD: spouse 85.2%, relative/friend 5.9%, unlicensed childcare 2%, licensed childcare 2.3%, licensed agency 1.1%, other 1.4%, no plan 2.1%

members, MSC and military spouses who work or who wish to work outside the home. The study concluded that: “*childcare is a problem for all service families no matter what type of*



deployment.<sup>xli</sup>

**Figure 4: Summary of LWFA Study (1998)<sup>xlii</sup>**

May have childcare problems if....	Single	MSC	Married (spouse works)	Married (spouse home)
	*5.7%	*12.7%	*50.1%	*30.1%
Go on major deployment	61%	53%	26%	13%
Deploy on emergency operations (48 hours notice)	56%	51%	25%	13%
Go on TD, exercises, courses, etc...	48%	38%	20%	13%

\* Designates the percentage of survey respondents that fall into each category

The LFWA study suggests that the national childcare crisis is having a direct impact on readiness within the CF. It is feared that this trend may eventually translate into attrition, a pattern experienced in the US military prior to the introduction of the *Military Child Care Act* in the late 1980's. The CF does not keep statistics that describe the specific reasons that individuals leave the military.<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> It is known, however, that women leave at a greater rate than men<sup>††††</sup> and that the stress of juggling family and career is a factor in their decision to leave.<sup>xlii</sup> The same may be true for their male counterparts who feel that, due to family obligations, they are unable to meet the expectations of a military system which, despite limited efforts to evolve, continues to depend upon traditional societal norms (i.e. spouse stays at home) to function.<sup>xliii</sup> Anecdotal evidence suggests that many soldiers retire for reasons related to QOL. It can be reasonably assumed that lack of access to suitable childcare support is one of those reasons.<sup>xliv</sup>

\*\*\*\* This fact was noted in the recently published *Minister's Advisory Board on CF Gender Integration and Employment Equity – 2001 Report* [<http://www.dnd.ca/menu/press/Reports/CFGIEE/INDEX-E.HTM>]. If the CF is serious about addressing retention problems, it must begin collecting such data.

†††† The 2001 report of the *Minister's Advisory Board on CF Gender Integration and Employment Equity* provides the following attrition rates:

**Table D: Average Attrition Rates By Regular Force Occupational Group (1989-1999)**

Occupational Group	Officers		Non-Commissioned Officers	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Combat Arms	14.9	6.1	30.4	9.2
Naval Operations/Technical	13.9	6.7	14.3	7.6
Air Operations/Technical	8.9	7.5	6.0	6.2
Engineering/Communications	8.3	7.7	8.9	7.0
Medical/Dental	9.5	9.7	8.8	7.3
Support	7.0	7.3	7.2	7.3

Lack of childcare support directly affects the QOL of service families in other ways.

Fifty-one percent of service members are married to non-service personnel and have children.<sup>xlv</sup>

The SCONDVA report made six specific recommendations designed to facilitate the ability of

service spouses to work.<sup>xlvi</sup> Surprisingly, increasing access to childcare was not one of them. Across the country, seven out of ten women with children under the age of six work outside the home.<sup>xlvii</sup> The inability of the CF to cater to the particular childcare challenges faced by military communities places military spouses at a decided disadvantage when it comes to entering the workplace. Military spouses who cannot locate suitable, affordable childcare may choose to remain at home. This means that their families do not enjoy the enhanced quality of life that a double income might bring.<sup>xlviii</sup>

The only service members who do not have to struggle with issue of accessibility are those who serve in the province of Quebec. In 1997, Quebec announced the creation of a provincial childcare system in which all children five and below would be guaranteed quality care for \$5.00 per day and school-aged children 12 and under would be provided with care before and after school.<sup>xlix</sup> The failure of the Armed Forces to address childcare as a CF-wide concern places military families at a disadvantage with regard to access to childcare, except in Quebec. This runs counter to the CF's pledge to provide "*a consistent and comprehensive level of support wherever the military family is located and whenever the family is required to move.*"<sup>1</sup>

Quality. **Annex C** shows that childcare standards vary significantly from province to province and that Quebec maintains the highest standards for childcare centres by a considerable margin.<sup>li</sup> On the other end of the scale, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Yukon and the Northwest Territories, do not require staff in childcare centres to have any childcare training at all.<sup>lii</sup> Only Saskatchewan, Quebec, PEI and Yukon require in-home childcare providers to undergo training prior to opening an in-home facility.

In theory, regulated childcare provides a higher quality of care than unregulated care because regulated providers must meet provincial standards.<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> However, none of the provincial standards for regulated childcare meet what experts consider to be ideal levels.<sup>liii</sup> Despite provincial regulations, moreover, a recent study found that custodial-level care is the norm in many childcare centers.<sup>liv</sup> Some fail to comply with provincial standards altogether.<sup>§§§§</sup> The situation with respect to in-home care is even more disturbing. The same study determined that many regulated homes offer basic levels of custodial care that are not sufficient to “stimulate development.”<sup>lv</sup> Of all in-home childcare arrangements in Canada, only 8.8 percent are regulated and (nominally) required to comply with specific health and safety standards while 75% of all Canadian children under the age of six are cared for in unregulated homes. The number of military dependants in unregulated care may be even higher given the lack of regulated services in the vicinity of many large CF bases.

In summary, specific concerns related to the quality of childcare for CF families are two-fold. First, service members serving in certain jurisdictions, particularly in Quebec, enjoy access to a higher quality of regulated childcare than is available to many of their colleagues serving elsewhere. Second, the general quality of childcare available throughout the country is low. “Custodial level care” is simply not acceptable; but it is the norm in many facilities. If the QOL of service members and their families is a concern for military commanders, the existing situation should raise a red flag.

Affordability. Quality childcare tends to be expensive, too expensive for most modest and middle-income Canadians.<sup>lvi</sup> (**Annex D** provides a listing of the average cost of regulated

---

<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> Common elements in provincial regulations for both centre and in-home childcare include: the training level of daycare providers (Early Childhood Education (ECE) and first aid training), the ratio of children to adults, group size, and specific health and safety issues. Endnotes 33 and 51 refer.

<sup>§§§§</sup> Martha Friendly, Director of the Childcare Resource and Research Unit of the University of Toronto notes that the “*actual monitoring of regulated care and the ability to enforce standards are very irregular*” across the nation. This means that, even in those jurisdictions that allow for inspections (and not all do, Annex C

childcare by province.) Unregulated childcare is generally cheaper than regulated care and the only viable option for the majority of Canadian families, including military families. \*\*\*\*<sup>lvii</sup>

The Federal Government and provinces offer Child Tax Care credits to families; however, they are not substantial and, in many provinces, unavailable to middle-income families.<sup>lviii</sup> All provinces also offer subsidized childcare spaces to lower income families and approximately 31% of all regulated childcare spaces in Canada are subsidized.<sup>lix</sup> (**Annex E** provides subsidy rates by province.) Unfortunately, there is a great discrepancy between provinces in the salary levels that qualify for spaces; whereas, in Quebec, all families are eligible for subsidized care.<sup>lxxxx</sup> As a result, the children of military personnel do not benefit universally from financial assistance for childcare, except in the province of Quebec. This is unfair to military families that live outside of Quebec.

The new CF Post-Living Differential (PLD) is supposed to take into account differences in the average cost of childcare and taxation rates (including child tax benefits) between provinces.<sup>lx</sup> **Annex F** demonstrates that there is not a recognizable correlation between PLD rates and average childcare rates paid across the nation or even within provinces. The situation becomes even more distorted when childcare subsidies are considered, because only certain individuals benefit from them and they are not factored into PLD rates.<sup>lxi</sup>

Of greater concern, the basket of goods and services upon which the PLD rate is calculated only commits a *weighting factor* of 3.53 for the category “*domestic service and*

---

refers), they are often not carried out. When childcare facilities are found not to comply with regulations, it is often very difficult to force them to adhere to standards or to shut them down. [Ref: Telecon between the author and Martha Friendly, Director of the Childcare Resource and Research Unit, 29 March 2001]

\*\*\*\* Leesa Tanner, *DND Daycare Needs Analysis for the National Capital Region* (Ottawa: Director Human Resources Research and Evaluation (DHRRE), 2001), pp. ii and 13-17 noted that, while there was a demonstrated demand for a DND childcare centre in the National Capital Region, the estimated cost of \$621-\$821/month was above the average maximum of \$503.60/month that DND personnel were willing to pay. According to Annex D, \$621/month falls well within the average cost of regulated centre childcare in BC, Ontario and Yukon while \$503.60/month falls **below** the average cost for regulated centre childcare of **all** provinces **except** Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and PEI. This suggests that the cost of regulated centre childcare may be beyond the purse of many CF families.

lxxxx Low-income families in Quebec are eligible for further subsidies that can reduce childcare costs to as little as two dollars per day from the universal five-dollar-per-day rate.

*childcare*”<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> while it allows similar or more substantial weighting for non-essential items such as: 4.44 for “*tobacco*”, 3.46% for “*alcohol*”, 15.86% for “*recreation, and*” 8.49 for “*food away from home.*”<sup>lxii</sup> The departmental document which describes the formula explains that: “*category weights are the relative importance of the ten item groupings within goods and services as determined for the CF representative family.*”<sup>lxiii</sup> It might be suggested that the model does not appropriately depict the priorities of the “CF representative family.” Childcare is a necessity for many families, not a “nice to have” like tobacco, alcohol, recreation and meals at MacDonalds. Unfortunately, even if the PLD rate was adjusted to more satisfactorily compensate families for childcare expenses, it could not compensate for the general lack of availability and poor quality of childcare that prevails throughout much of Canada. The best means of addressing this situation is by ensuring that all CF members have equitable access to quality, affordable childcare.

### THE CF RESPONSE TO THE CRISIS

The *SCONDVA Report* did a credible job of documenting the impact that the national childcare crisis is having on the CF in terms of recruiting, retention, readiness and the QOL of its members. The *Report* made two specific recommendations related to childcare: First, that all military personnel should be “*required to prepare a plan according to predetermined criteria to ensure that whenever they deploy, their childcare requirements will be met;*” and, second, that DND should “*develop a plan to ensure emergency childcare when military members deploy with less notice than provided for in their childcare plan submitted to their commanders....*”<sup>lxiv</sup> The CF has implemented these measures as follows.

---

<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> This category includes childcare, casual babysitting and domestic housecleaning services. Of the three, childcare is a necessity for many Canadian families while domestic housecleaning services and even casual babysitting are not. The argument that childcare is a necessity to enable parents to work is made repeatedly in many governmental and non-governmental studies; yet, it seems to be ignored in the CF weighting system.

The Family Care Plan (FCP). As a result of the SCONDVA recommendations, all service members who have children must complete a plan outlining their childcare arrangements in the event of a deployment. While well-intentioned, a difficulty arises when parents do not enjoy access to quality, affordable childcare that is flexible and available when they need it. Under such circumstances, the development of a childcare plan can become a frustrating and futile act. The LFWA study, for example, revealed that two to three percent of respondents did not have a secondary childcare plan. Of those that did, eighty-four percent stated that a spouse, family or friend would provide care in their long-term or unexpected absence, an unrealistic solution in many cases but one that meets the requirement to have “a plan.”<sup>lxv</sup> Many soldiers argue that the childcare plan simply serves as a means for politicians and commanders to cover themselves in the event that childcare difficulties interfere with a service person’s ability to deploy. Other than ensuring that service members have thought about childcare in time of emergency, the requirement to have a childcare plan does nothing to address the serious challenges that CF families face with regard to securing suitable childcare for their children in the event of deployment.

Family Care Assistance (FCA). The Chief of Defence Staff (CDS) recently announced the creation of a FCA program the aim of which is to “*help offset*” family care costs incurred “*that are in excess of those normally paid during normal working hours.*”<sup>lxvi</sup> The taxable benefit is limited to MSC and single members. The program helps defer some of the costs associated with military-imposed childcare costs out of the ordinary and is a welcome step in the right direction. Unfortunately, its applicability is limited. For example, it does nothing to help alleviate the “excess” childcare costs that

are incurred by deployed service members whose spouses work outside the home. Nor does it address the wider concerns of overall accessibility, quality and total cost.

MFRC Initiatives. In addition to the introduction of FCP and FCA, the Director General Military Services (DGMS), through the Military Family Resource Centre (MFRC) network, has launched two broad initiatives designed to assist service members with childcare. The first, entitled the *Deployment and Emergency Childcare Service*, is designed to provide access to affordable, regulated childcare and to address “*financial hardship to families during an emergency...*”<sup>lxvii</sup> Under the terms of the service, MFRC’s will coordinate access to regulated childcare on behalf of families in the event of emergency. Service members are reimbursed for the first 24 hours of emergency care and, for those with a “*total family income (gross)*” of less than \$60,000 per annum, for a specified percentage of the cost of care for up to six additional days.<sup>lxviii</sup> The program does a certain amount to mitigate the financial hardship associated with short-term emergency deployments, particularly for lower income families.

In addition to this, DGMS has drafted *DMFS Guideline No 14, Relationship Between Military Family Resource Centres and Daycare Centres*, which provides specific guidelines to MFRCs related to the provision of childcare services. According to the *Guideline*, all MRFCs are mandated to provide “*casual/respice childcare, childcare during MRFC programs/events, preschool playgroups led by trained facilitators, and alternative childcare information and referral for parents...*”<sup>lxix</sup> However, they are not funded to provided regulated childcare of the type that is required by military members and their working spouses on an ongoing basis. MRFCs may develop “*site-specific services*” including “*licensed daycare and family home daycare support.*”<sup>lxx</sup> *Guideline 14* states that these services “*may be funded through various*



*combinations of public and/or NPF at the discretion of, and in partnership with, base/wing/station commanders, and/or through user fees, fundraising activities, donor contributions and/or provincial grants.*”<sup>lxxi</sup> Therefore, while MFRCs are not permitted to fund regulated childcare, base commanders are.

This introduces another significant inequality related to QOL benefits provided throughout the CF: some base commanders support childcare programs liberally; others do not support them at all. Moreover, base-supported childcare centres can only provide regulated care for a very small percentage of the children requiring it.<sup>§§§§§</sup> Accordingly, individuals posted from location to location are presented with an enormous discrepancy in access to quality childcare services dependant upon availability, cost, provincial standards and the extent to which local commanders are sensitive to childcare requirements. These discrepancies exist not only between bases but also within bases given that only a limited number of service families in any location benefit from CF support to childcare. In principle, military-sponsored childcare programs should be universal in their application and equitable in their benefit to all service families. To provide a few with CF-sponsored care flies in the face of promises to provide equal access to QOL services throughout the CF.

#### THE US MILITARY SOLUTION – POTENTIAL APPLICABILITY TO THE CF

*“...the best chance a family has to be guaranteed affordable and high-quality childcare in this country [US] is to join the military.”*<sup>lxxii</sup>

In the late 1980’s, the US military faced a childcare crisis similar to that currently plaguing the CF. As a result, Congress passed the 1989 *Military Child Care Act (MCCA)* which ordered the Armed Forces to establish a universal childcare system that addressed the specific

---

<sup>§§§§§</sup> An in formal telephone poll of various MRFCs and DMFS’ office in Ottawa conducted by the author in February and March of 2001 revealed that the explanation for this phenomenon is that DND does not wish to “*compete with the private sector*” in the provision of childcare services. The argument is rather ludicrous given the severe shortage of regulated childcare spaces across much of the nation. The *SCONDVA Report* explained its inability to recommend the creation of childcare system by noting that: “*Treasury Board policies prevent the use of federal public funds to subsidize childcare costs.*” If the will existed, Treasury Board (TB) policies could

concerns of accessibility, quality and affordability. The resulting program has four key elements: Childcare Development Centres (CDC), Family Child Care (FCC), School-Age Care (SAC), and childcare Resource and Referral Programs (R&R).<sup>lxxiii</sup> The US Government points to the military childcare system as a model of how publicly funded childcare systems should work.<sup>lxxiv</sup> While the will and financial means may not exist in Canada to fund all aspects of the program, lessons can be learned from the approach of the US Armed Forces, particularly with respect to access, quality and cost.

---

be changed. Moreover, the specific nature of the TB policy is unclear as *DMFS Guideline No 14, Op.Cit.*, states that base commanders may provide support to on-site childcare centres (located on their bases) with public funds. Some chose to do so subsidizing infrastructure, utility and other miscellaneous costs.

Access. Significant funds have gone into building childcare centres. Nonetheless, there remain insufficient CDC spaces to meet the requirements of all military personnel. Accordingly, the FCC program has been expanded to help compensate for the shortfall in spaces.<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup> It provides military-regulated in-home care to families requiring it and caters specifically to the requirements of parents who work shifts, nights, weekends, have children with special needs, or are deployed, roles which the CDCs are not designed to fill.<sup>lxxv</sup> The R&R Program, similar to the referral program currently offered by CF MFRCs, fits in where the FCC program ends ensuring that all military families are able to find “*at least one affordable child care option located either on or off the military base.*”<sup>lxxvi</sup> This program also assists families who may wish to employ nannies or au pairs in their own homes. The SAC Program coordinates before and after school programs as well as summer and holiday camps, all of which must meet specific standards. In a recent initiative, bases have begun partnering with schools to provide more extensive programs before and after school.

Quality. Childcare has been made a command responsibility in the US military. Childcare specialists are employed to run *Children and Youth Services* on every base and commanders are assessed on the quality and effectiveness of their childcare systems. All CDCs are required to meet Department of Defense (DoD) accreditation standards, which are set at the median of state regulations. CDCs are encouraged to meet higher national accreditation standards and over 95% have done so to date.<sup>lxxvii</sup> This ensures that the military childcare program provides higher quality care than is generally available within the civilian sector where only 8% of daycare centres have met national accreditation standards.<sup>lxxviii</sup> CDCs are subjected to a minimum of four inspections per year that evaluate health and sanitation, fire and general safety, and early childhood development programs. Prior to being employed, childcare workers

---

<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup> Where there are an insufficient number of FCCs located on bases, off-base “affiliated homes” are certified to meet demand.

are required to undergo basic childcare training, funded by the military. Subsequent promotions and raises are based upon the completion of further training. Annual refresher training is also required for all childcare providers. The fact that military childcare centre workers are better trained and receive a higher salary than the national norm, results in a lower turnover rate and better overall quality childcare.<sup>lxxix</sup>

To ensure quality care within the FCC Program, childcare providers must meet certification requirements similar to those required of CDC workers. Before they are certified, personnel offering FCC are provided with child development, first aid, health and safety, nutrition and small business operations training paid for by the military.<sup>lxxx</sup> They also undergo annual refresher training during the period that they remain in business and are subject to unannounced inspections on a quarterly basis. This ensures that the quality of care provided in FCCs is consistent across the Armed Forces and remains well above the national average.

Cost. Third, the salaries of CDC employees are primarily paid by fees charged on a forces-wide scale based on family income. Universality is a cornerstone of the program and everyone benefits to some extent, regardless of salary.<sup>lxxxx</sup> The military matches the childcare fees paid by parents dollar for dollar. The money is used to subsidize the building of infrastructure, the procurement of supplies, the training of personnel, and the costs of some salaries. In this way, the military subsidizes childcare rather than providing monies directly to cash-strapped parents that may not be spent on the best quality care. The Armed Forces do not

lxxxx The scale ensures that military personnel pay rates that they can afford which are somewhat below the national average. (Footnote \* on page 12 suggests that this might be a useful approach for the Canadian Forces as many military personnel cannot afford to pay the average national rates for regulated centre-based care.) The 2001 US Armed Forces scale is as follows:

Category	Family Income	Weekly Fee Per Child	High Cost Range (Optional)
I	\$ (US) 0 – 23,000	\$ (US) 40-53	\$ (US) 45 – 56
II	23,001 – 34,000	50 – 64	55 – 68
III	34,001 – 44,000	61 – 76	67 – 81
IV	44,001 – 55,000	74 – 86	80 – 92
V	55,001- 69,000	88 – 100	91 – 105
VI	70,000+	103 - 114	104 - 116

Source: Memorandum for Assistant Secretary of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Director Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), Director National Security Agency (NSA), *DoD Child Care Fee Ranges for School Year 2000-2001* [<http://www.dtic.mil/perdiem/bahfaq/html>]

have a statutory requirement to subsidize FCCs other than through the provision of training. Nonetheless, the MCCA does authorize base commanders to provide such subsidization in order to ensure that quality “family home day care services can be provided to members of the Armed Forces at a cost comparable to the cost of services provided by CDCs.”<sup>lxxxxi</sup>

The Potential Applicability to the CF. Given the current fiscal constraints under which the CF is operating, it may not be feasible to implement a childcare system that emulates the US military model in its entirety.<sup>+++++</sup> There is no reason, however, why the CF could not actively encourage non-profit daycare centres to open on or near military bases in order to augment the capacity of military CDCs.<sup>§§§§§</sup> The CF could demand that all on-site centres reach specific DND accreditation standards<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup> and encourage off-site centres that cater to large concentrations of military personnel to do the same. Infrastructure, utilities and other miscellaneous support could be provided a no or minimal cost to on-site CDCs, thereby reducing the cost of childcare. To accomplish this, the current ability of Base Commanders to provide assistance to on-site child care programs could be formalized to ensure uniformity of support across the CF. A program of accreditation for on-site CDCs and FCCs could be set up under the auspices of the MFRCs. In addition, a training program for daycare workers and in-home care providers should be implemented and funded. To ensure quality, periodic inspections should also be part of the

---

<sup>+++++</sup> The cost of childcare in the US military system is split 50/50 between parents and the military. United States Accounting Office, *Child Care – How do Military and Civilian Centre Costs Compare?*, Op.Cit., found that the average cost per child per year for CDC care was \$7,200 (US) which is comparable to the \$8,500 (Cdn) that a Canadian study estimated that quality care would cost per year in Canada. See: Cleveland and Krashinsky, *The Benefits and Costs of Good ChildCare*, Op.Cit. The US average cost per child is 7% higher than the cost of comparable care in the civilian sector; however, the military pays higher average salaries than the civilian sector and there are a “significantly higher number of infants and toddlers in military centres (48%) versus civilian centres (15%).” (Infant/toddler childcare is more expensive than care for older children). The US DoD philosophy is that “child care [is] ...a workforce issue that is critical to the overall accomplishment of the military mission.” *Military Children and Youth Frequently Asked Questions About Military Child Care* [[http://military-childrenandyouth.calib.com/mm\\_faq.htm](http://military-childrenandyouth.calib.com/mm_faq.htm)]. United States Accounting Office, *Child Care – How do Military and Civilian Centre Costs Compare?*, Op.Cit., Rand Research Brief, *The Armed Services’ Response to the Military Child Care Act*, (RAND, 1998) [<http://www.rand.org/publications/RB/RB7521>] and Nancy Campbell, *Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation’s Child Care System*, Op.Cit., all emphasize that it was not easy for the US forces to divert funds to support childcare, particularly at a time of downsizing; however, it was felt that there was no choice if the military wished to improve its readiness and retention levels.

<sup>§§§§§</sup> It is preferable that non-profit centres be encouraged to open rather than “for profit” centres as the former tend to maintain higher standards of quality than the latter. Also, the fees charged by non-profit centres tend to be less than those charged by childcare centres seeking to make a profit. Endnote 51 refers.

regime. Most MFRCs already have a childcare referral system (R&R) that could be enhanced where required to ensure that all personnel have access to either CF-certified care or, if they prefer, regulated commercial care. Bases might also consider working together with local school

---

\*\*\*\*\* DND national childcare standards are supposed to exist and are referred to in *DMFS Guideline 14 – Relationship Between Military Family Resource Centres and Daycare Centres*. [Op.Cit.](#)

boards to establish before and after school programs where they do not exist in sufficient quantity.

**At minimal cost, therefore, a network of CF-accredited CDCs and FCCs could be established to provide enhanced access to a much higher standard of childcare than is currently available to most CF members.** Such a network of childcare options would provide immediate and widespread benefit to the QOL of military families by ensuring that a high-quality, affordable childcare of consistent quality is available wherever they may reside. The enormous gap between the cost of childcare in Quebec and the rest of the country remains a concern, however. An adjustment to the PLD could be introduced as a temporary solution. Alternatively, a study might be done to confirm the feasibility of subsidizing military parents serving outside Quebec to bring their childcare costs more in line with those of personnel serving within Quebec. This might be a preferable solution as federal and provincial childcare subsidies could be more easily factored into the equation and funds could be directed only to those families with children under 12 years of age who are in childcare.<sup>+++++</sup> In the longer term, however, the military might consider the development of a system of direct subsidization to on-site CDCs and FCCs rather than subsidizing parents who, faced with competing financial priorities, may have a tendency to spend childcare funds on less-than-quality care. In this way, the CF would ensure that the children of all military personnel truly benefit from equitable access to affordable, quality care wherever their parents may serve.

---

<sup>+++++</sup> This plan should include subsidization for all married service persons with children under twelve who are in childcare to ensure that all military families benefit equally. This will make certain that all children can benefit from early childhood education programs offered in regulated childcare facilities. (Refer to the discussion on pages 3-4 regarding the benefits of early childhood education). The industry standard is that childcare subsidies apply equally to all employees with children and not only to single parents and MSC-equivalents. This ensures that the QOL of all families is enhanced and that support is not just provided to those families that require childcare to enable their parents to go to work for the organization providing the subsidy. Such subsidization would have to take into consideration differences in provincial tax rates, child tax credits and childcare subsidies. With regard to equitable application, the *LFWA Study(Data Analysis Report)*, Op.Cit.,p. 13 concluded that: *“Any intervention of policy relating to childcare provision must aim to treat all interested groups fairly and equitably. For example, providing childcare (or providing financial assistance for childcare) to single parents or to personnel whose spouses also work may help to offset some of the challenges these groups are facing regarding childcare availability. However, this could be perceived as inequitable by those whose spouses provide childcare, but as a result, forego a second income and thus have lower overall family incomes.”*

## CONCLUSION

Childcare is a necessity for many Canadian families. They cannot work without it. The “national childcare crisis” has resulted in a shortage of affordable, quality childcare across the nation, which places a particular burden on military families. The *SCONDVA Report* highlighted the impact that the childcare crisis has had on retention, recruiting, readiness and QOL within the CF. Unfortunately, it failed to make any concrete recommendations to resolve the problem.

Universality, a key tenet of CF QOL programs, does not apply when it comes to childcare. Some bases have on-site childcare centres while others do not; and there are significant differences in the quality and cost of those services that are available depending upon the province in which they are located and the amount of support that is provided by local base commanders. Moreover, since the introduction of the universal five-dollar-per day childcare system in the province of Quebec, accessibility, cost and quality have ceased to be concerns for CF members posted there. This places service members serving elsewhere at a decided disadvantage that is not adequately compensated for in existing QOL-related programs such as PLD, FCA and FCP.

The US military, faced with similar challenges in the late 1980's, created a childcare system that resolved many of its childcare related HR problems. The CF has been presented with a unique opportunity to do the same. The CF could sponsor a network of on-site, non-profit CDCs and FCCs, roughly based on the US model, that would go far towards addressing the issues of access and quality by placing the control of these areas in the hands of the military. The Armed Forces would be seen as taking a national lead with regard to finding progressive and flexible solutions to the childcare challenges it faces while contributing positively to its image as an employer of choice. Recruiting and retention will surely improve, thereby enabling the CF to



better attract and retain the best and the brightest candidates into its ranks. Moreover, proactively addressing the childcare issue will serve to improve the QOL of military families, providing military personnel with greater peace of mind and flexibility to meet service exigencies while affording military spouses greater freedom to work. The development of a universal childcare system may appear to be a radical step for a conservative institution such as the CF. A decade ago, the US military thought so too, until it began to reap the rewards in terms of enhanced readiness and retention levels. Unfortunately, until the CF is better able to adopt its childcare-related policies to meet the requirements of its personnel, it will continue to suffer in terms of recruiting, retention, readiness and reduced QOL for military families who deserve much better.

---

<sup>i</sup> The Standing Committee on National Defence and Veteran's Affairs (SCONDVA), *Moving Forward: A Strategic Plan for Quality of Life Improvements in the Canadian Forces* (Ottawa: Government of Canada, October 1998), Chap 5 [<http://www.parl.gc.ca/InfoComDoc/36/1/NDVA/Studies/Reports/ndvarp03-e.htm>] hereafter referred to as the *SCONDVA Report*.

<sup>ii</sup> Although the term “crisis” is widely used by academics, researchers and writers in literature related to child care in Canada, it was specifically borrowed from Gordon Cleveland and Michael Krashinsky, *The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care: The Economic Rationale for Public Investment in Young Children-A Policy Study* (Toronto: University of Toronto, March 1998).

Rita Chudnovsky in *The View from Canada*. Presented at an International Symposium entitled “Advancing Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada, the US, the UK and Australia” [<http://www.childcarecanada.org/resources/CRRUpubs/plenary/ec4.html>] cites statistics that suggest that the majority of Canadians also view the situation as a “crisis”: “89%% of Canadians agree that high quality child care is an important factor that will help ensure Canada’s future and economic well-being; 81% think that governments should develop a plan to improve child care and 78% believe that government should spend more money on child care to ensure high quality fees that every family can afford. Rarely do we see public opinions polled that so clearly highlight a very strong sense, albeit very general, that the public supports an increase in investment in the early years.”

<sup>iii</sup> This is widely acknowledged by the federal and provincial/territorial governments and academics, researchers and advocates and is a recurring theme in numerous studies and reports. See, for example:

- Gillian Doherty et al, *Child Care: Canada Can't Work Without It*, Occasional Paper No. 5 (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, 1995)
- The Atkinson Letter, *Universal Early Childhood Development Services: Time For Action* (Parts I and II) (Toronto: The Atkinson Charitable Foundation, 21 January 2000)
- National Council of Welfare, *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep* (Ottawa: National Council of Welfare, 1999)
- Human Resources Development, *Improving Social Security in Canada – Child Care and Development: A Supplementary Paper* (Ottawa: Minister of Human Resources Development, 1994)
- Jan Beach and Jane Bertrand, *More Than the Sum of the Parts: An Early Childhood Development System for Canada* (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, October 2000)
- Martha Friendly, *What is the Public Interest in Child Care? Policy Options*, Jan/Feb 1997. [Excerpt available from: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]

The problem of lack of access to affordable, quality care is one also experienced throughout the United States. See: Nancy Campbell (National Women's Law Centre), *Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation's Child Care System* (Washington, DC: National Women's Law Centre, April 2000)

---

<sup>iv</sup> Refer to *Annex A – CF Members With and Without Children* which was based on a Director Human Resources Information Management Ad Hoc Statistical Report dated 9 March 2001. Note that the Ad Hoc Statistical Reports are based on data provided by *PeopleSoft* (the CF’s human resources ADP program) and that it may contain some inaccuracies due to inaccuracies in data input into the system from across the CF.

<sup>v</sup> Over fifty-six percent of military personnel are married with children as opposed to 47.5% of the general population who are married but who may or may not have children. (Both these figures include common law marriages). See **Annex A** and [www.statcan.ca](http://www.statcan.ca). The military population tends to be younger than the general population meaning that military families will be more likely to have young children at home than the average Canadian family. Military families tend to live in military communities. Accordingly, it is fair to assume that a greater percent of the population living in military communities will have young children living at home than is the case in an average civilian neighborhood. It is logical to extrapolate, therefore, that the requirement for schooling and childcare should be greater in military communities than in the general population.

<sup>vi</sup> This fact was addressed in both the *SCONDVA Report, Op.Cit.*, and in the 1998 DND/CF Report (Human Resources - Directorate of Strategic Human Resource Analysis - DSHRA), *The Canadian Family* (DND/CF: Ottawa, January 1998) [[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/dshra/engraph/newsletter/family\\_e.asp](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/dshra/engraph/newsletter/family_e.asp)] hereafter referred to as *The Canadian Family (1998)*. The latter concluded that: that “*demographic changes have serious implications for the CF/DND as we see more members requiring childcare or elder care if they are to be mobilized, deployed or posted.*”

<sup>vii</sup> Refer to discussion on pages 3-4 and references provided at endnotes 17 and 18.

<sup>viii</sup> This is also true of the military population who have no choice but to place their children in unregulated care due to a lack of regulated spaces and the high cost of quality care. See: Human Resources Development, *Improving Social Security in Canada – Child Care and Development: A Supplementary Paper*, *Op.cit.*, p. 9 and further discussion on pages 6-7 and 10-11 and related endnotes, **Figure 1** on page 7 and **Annex C**. This is a concern because unregulated childcare is generally of a lower quality than regulated childcare. Gillian Doherty et al, *You Bet I Care (Vol III)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Regulated Family Child Care Across Canada* (Guelph, Ont: University of Guelph, 2000), p. 123.

Doherty’s study provides a detailed analysis of the quality of care available in the 8.8% of in-home facilities that are regulated. Of the in-home facilities reviewed across the country, 7.8% provide “*inadequate to minimal custodial care,*” 23.8% provide “*minimal custodial care,*” and 31.6% provide “*good custodial care.*” Only 36.8% of regulated in-home facilities provide better than custodial care “*that includes the deliberate provision of activities to not only support but also stimulate children’s development.*” The report goes on to note that these “*findings should be a major concern for the whole society.*” (See *Executive Summary*). No similar statistics exist for unregulated in-home care; however, studies that have been done indicate that they generally provide even lower standards of care. For example, the National Council of Welfare, *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep*, *Op.Cit.*, pp. 17 states that: “*Most parents rely on unregulated care – often by family members and neighbors – where the quality of care is completely unpredictable. This creates unconscionable risks for children’s health and safety and unnecessary anxiety for their parents.*” The same report cites another study that found that: “*unregulated homes were likely to provide care that was ruled as inadequate.*” *Ibid.*, p.55.

---

<sup>ix</sup> See: *SCONDDVA Report, Op.Cit.*, Chap 5 and the sixth “change objective” of the *Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) 2001* which reads: “Career of Choice – Position Defence as a rewarding, flexible and progressive workplace that builds professional teams of innovative and highly skilled men and women dedicated to accomplishing the mission.” DND/CF (VCDS) *Defence Planning Guidance 2001* (Ottawa: DND, 2001) [[http://www.vcds.dnd.ca/dgsp/dpg/dpg2001/chap2\\_e.asp](http://www.vcds.dnd.ca/dgsp/dpg/dpg2001/chap2_e.asp)] The term “best and brightest” is cited from *DPG 2001, article 203, para 1a*.

<sup>x</sup>Childcare support can take many forms. The provision of on-site childcare centres and the subsidization of childcare on off-site locations are two of the most prevalent. Martha Friendly, Director of the Childcare Resource and Research Unit of the University of Toronto notes that such programs are very common in industry. [Ref: Telecon between the author and Martha Friendly, 30 March 2001.] IBM, Abbott Laboratories, The Body Shop, Johnson & Johnson, Microsoft, Lockheed, Shell, and the big three auto-makers (GM, Ford, Daimler/Chrysler) are among the hundreds of prominent employers that provide childcare services and/or subsidization to employees. See, for example, the following websites:

- IBM Canada: [www.canibm.com/news/latest\\_news/071200\\_childcare.htm](http://www.canibm.com/news/latest_news/071200_childcare.htm) and [www-3.ibm.com/employment/us/diverse/market\\_wl.html](http://www-3.ibm.com/employment/us/diverse/market_wl.html)
- Abbott Laboratories: [http://abott.com/career/work\\_life\\_programs.html](http://abott.com/career/work_life_programs.html)
- Johnson & Johnson: [http://www.jnj.com/careers/work\\_life.html](http://www.jnj.com/careers/work_life.html)
- Microsoft: [www.microsoft.com/diversity/worklife.asp](http://www.microsoft.com/diversity/worklife.asp)
- Shell: [www.shell.com](http://www.shell.com) and [www.shell.com/uk-en/content/0,4011,24711-50566,00.html](http://www.shell.com/uk-en/content/0,4011,24711-50566,00.html)
- GM: [www.gm.com/company/careers/benefits\\_edu](http://www.gm.com/company/careers/benefits_edu)
- Canadian Auto Workers (CAW): <http://www.caw.ca/whatwedo/woemn/childcare/october18.cfm>

<sup>xi</sup> This is particularly true for low-income parents. In the military context, lack of access to affordable, quality care is also a barrier to the spouses of military members who may wish or need to work. Also, see pages 7-10 for a discussion of the impact that it may have on the retention of women, single parents and married service couples, in particular. For a general discussion of the nature of the barriers presented by lack of access to affordable, quality care, refer to the following sources:

- Martha Friendly, *What is the Public Interest in Child Care?*, *Op.Cit.*, pp. 4-5.
- Cleveland and Krashinsky, *The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care: The Economic Rationale for Public Investment in Young Children - A Policy Study*, *Op.Cit.*
- The National Council of Welfare, *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep*, *Op.Cit.*, pp. 16-18.
- Human Resources Development, *Improving Social Security in Canada – Child Care and Development: A Supplementary Paper*, *Op.cit.*, Chap. 2.
- The Atkinson Letter, Universal *Early Childhood Development Services: Time For Action* (Parts I and II), (Toronto: The Atkinson Charitable Foundation, 21 January 2000), p.5.
- Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Is Child Care a Good Public Investment?*
- Martha Friendly, *What is the Public Interest in Child Care? Policy Options*, Jan/Feb 1997. [Available from: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]

- 
- Martha Friendly, *A National Child Care Program: Now is the Time*. Pediatric Child Health, Vol 5, No 5 July/Aug 2000. [Also avail from: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto]
  - Gillian Doherty, *Childcare: Canada Can't Work Without It*, Op.Cit
  - Jeffery Capizzano, et al, *ChildCare Patterns of School-Age Children with Employed Mothers* (The Urban Institute, September 2000) [<http://newfederalism.urban.org/html/op41/occa41.html>]
  - Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto [[www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]
  - Nancy Campbell (National Women's Law Centre) *Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation's Child Care System*, Op.Cit., Chaps 1 - 2.

<sup>xii</sup> Extrapolated from figures presented at **Annex A** based on a DHRIM Ad Hoc Statistical Report compiled 9 March 2001.

<sup>xiii</sup> A 1996 report cited in *The Canadian Family (1998)*, Op.Cit., noted that: "1 of every 13 CF families was headed by a single parent. In comparison, Statistics Canada reported that in 1996, 1 of every 6.7 Canadian families was headed by a single person." According to the percentages extrapolated from **Annex A**, at present, single parents head more than 10% of all CF families.

<sup>xiv</sup> These statistics contradict the national norm. In 1994-95, for example: "Almost all single parent families were headed by women: 681,000 single-parent families were headed by women and only 53,000 by men, a ratio of 13 to 1." The latest Statistics Canada figures (1996 census) show that there are 192,275 households headed by men in the country compared to 945,230 headed by females. [<http://www.statcan.ca>] While the number of men who are single parents has been rising steadily, children are still more likely, in the general population, to stay with their mothers when marriages break up. The National Council of Welfare, *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep*, Op.Cit., p. 4. This general rule obviously does not apply to the CF.

<sup>xv</sup> DND/CF (Land Forces Western Area HQ (LFWA HQ)), *Land Forces Western Area Childcare Support Survey 1998 and Data Analysis Report* (Edmonton: CF – HQ LFWA, 1998). See also **Figure 4** on page 9, which provides a summary of the LFWA readiness data broken down by marital status.

<sup>xvi</sup> Nancy Campbell et al (National Women's Law Centre), *Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation's Child Care System*, Op.Cit., pp. 1-2. The US military recognized in the late 1980's that, as a result of poor access to quality, affordable childcare in the US military, "work force recruiting, motivation, productivity and retention were suffering – and consequently, military readiness was at risk." Ibid., p.6.

<sup>xvii</sup> Numerous studies have shown this to be the case. See, for example, research cited in:

- The Atkinson Letter, *Universal Early Childhood Development Services: Time For Action* (Parts I and II), Op.Cit., p.5. Part I discusses the benefits of childcare and cites two specific recent studies. The first showed that "40% of children in ECE [Early Childhood Education] programs were judged by their teachers to be at the top of their class in communication skills as opposed to 25% who did not take part in such programs....these results were true regardless of the family's income or the mother's education." The second indicated that "high quality day care children had higher cognitive test scores from toddlers to age 21," their ongoing academic achievement levels were higher and they "were more likely to attend a four-year college."

- 
- Cleveland and Krashinsky, *The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care: The Economic Rationale for Public Investment in Young Children - A Policy Study*, Op.Cit., Chaps 2 and 5. Chap 2 provides a summary of much of the relevant research in this area.
  - Martha Friendly, *What is the Public Interest in Child Care?* Op.Cit. provides a short summary of the benefits of quality childcare and the negative effects that result when children are denied access to it.
  - Human Resources Development, *Improving Social Security in Canada – Child Care and Development: A Supplementary Paper*, Op.cit., Chap 3 is entitled “What we Know About Child Development and Effective Child Care.” It summarizes the current research by stating that: “*Children who have been in poor quality childcare are more likely to have difficulties in school: behavioral problems, poor social skills, poor academic performance relative to their apparent ability and less independence.*” (p. 12)
  - The National Council of Welfare, *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep*, Op.Cit., Chap III
  - Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Is Child Care a Good Public Investment?* [Available from the Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]
  - Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *What Does Research Tell Us About Quality in Child Care? ?* [Available from the Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]
  - Gillian Doherty et al, *Child Care: Canada Can’t Work Without It*, Op.Cit., p. 6-9
  - Martha Friendly, *Is Childcare a Good Public Investment?* Op.Cit.[Available from the Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]
  - United States Accounting Office, Report to Congressional Requesters *Child Care – How do Military and Civilian Centre Costs Compare?* (Washington: General Accounting Office, 14 Oct 1999), pp.1and 10.

<sup>xviii</sup> See: These figures are from an economic study undertaken by Cleveland and Krashinsky, *The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care: The Economic Rationale for Public Investment in Young Children - A Policy Study*, Op.Cit. See also: *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep*, Op.Cit., p. 71-78 which cites other studies that reach a similar conclusion.

<sup>xix</sup> The National Council of Welfare, *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep*, Op.Cit., p. 21.

<sup>xx</sup> See the Health Canada’s list of “*determinants of population health*” in Ibid., p.21-22.

<sup>xxi</sup> Ibid., pp. 21-25 and 71-74 and Gillian Doherty et al, *Child Care: Canada Can’t Work Without It*, Op.Cit., p.3-5. A US study cited in *The Canadian Family (1998)*, Op.Cit. explored the stress experienced by military mothers and their children when the mothers were deployed. It determined that “*any effort made to ease the disruption to children’s lives during deployment of the mother (providing childcare, financial support and extended family services to caregivers and extended family members) will reduce the negative impacts on both children and parent in the military family.*”

<sup>xxii</sup> The National Council of Welfare, *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep*, Op.Cit., pp. 21-25 and 72-74, and Hillel Goelman et al, *You Bet I Care (Vol II)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Child Care Centres Across Canada*, Op.Cit., p.90. The latter source cites a US Department of Health and Human Services report that noted: “[*parents*] might be more effective employees if they do not have concerns about the environment in which their children spend a good part of each working day.”

<sup>xxiii</sup> See: The National Council of Welfare, *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep*, Op.Cit., p. 21-25 and 71-74 and Cleveland and Krashinsky, *The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care: The Economic Rationale for Public Investment in Young Children - A Policy Study*, Op.Cit. and Martha Friendly, *What is the Public Interest in Child Care?* Op.Cit., pp. 3-5.

Childcare is important to all parents. Nationally, however, women devote an average of one and on-half hours more time per day to “unpaid work activities” such as housework and childcare than their male counterparts. This means that, in general terms, the management of childcare continues to fall more heavily upon the shoulders of women than men. Government of Canada (Statistics Canada), *Women in*

---

*Canada 2000* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2000), p. 97. Such trends also appear to apply to the CF where over 50% of women and 40% of men report taking time off for childcare-related reasons. Refer to **Table A** at footnote \* on page 4 based upon: Catherine Lee, *Needs Analysis Report on Workplace Daycare Centre(s) and Information and Referral Services for Child and Elder Care* (Ottawa: Directorate of Civilian Human Resource Planning (DCHRP), 21 July 1993). This suggests that childcare concerns place a stress on all parents but particularly on women. This may be a factor in military retention rates. See the discussion of this phenomenon on page 9.

<sup>xxiv</sup> Estimates are that the CF may shrink to approximately 43,000 persons in the next few years. See: Robert Fife, *Airman Eyed for Defence Post*, National Post, 16 March 2001.

<sup>xxv</sup> Martha Friendly, *What is the Public Interest in Child Care?* Op.Cit., pp.3-5 and Gillian Doherty, *Child Care: Canada Can't Work Without It* Op.Cit., p.3-5.

<sup>xxvi</sup> While immigrant men and women have overall higher levels of education than the Canadian average, they tend to end up in lower-paying jobs. This is particularly true of new immigrants. Immigrant women, moreover, are more likely to be unemployed (i.e. actively seeking work but unable to find it) than the average female Canadian. Government of Canada (Statistics Canada) *Women in Canada 2000*, Op.Cit. Chap 10. The report provides the statistics that appear in **Tables B** and **C** in the footnotes on pages 4 and 5.

<sup>xxvii</sup> The National Council of Welfare, *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep*, Op.Cit., p. 44.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Martha Friendly, *A National Child Care Program: Now is the Time*. Op.Cit. [Available from: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)].

For a general history of childcare in Canada refer to:

- Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998*, Op.Cit., pp. i - ii. Descriptions of the development of provincial and territorial systems are included in the sections dedicated to each province and territory.
- Jan Beach and Jane Bertrand, *More Than the Sum of the Parts: An Early Childhood Development System for Canada*, Op.Cit., Sections 2-4.

<sup>xxix</sup> In 1997, for example, the Chretien Government announced the *National Children's Agenda*, which was designed to foster childcare across the country. Unfortunately, when funding to healthcare was cut, the provinces refused to support the *Agenda* despite the fact that all agreed it was important. Little headway has been made since. For more information, refer to: *Background Information on the National Child Benefit System Announced in the Speech from the Throne* September 23, 1997 [[http://socialunion.gc.ca/news/dia210600\\_e.html](http://socialunion.gc.ca/news/dia210600_e.html)]; Public *Dialogue on the National Children's Agenda – Developing a Shared Vision* (Government of Canada) [[http://socialunion.gc.ca/nca/June21-2000/english/index\\_e.html](http://socialunion.gc.ca/nca/June21-2000/english/index_e.html)]; Human Resources Development Canada (news release), *What Canadians are Telling Us About the National Children's Agenda*, 21 June 2000 [<http://www.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/common/news/hmib/00-42.shtml>]; Pettigrew Pierre, Notes for an Address by The Honorable Pierre Pettigrew, Min of Human Resources Development Canada, *A National Children's Agenda: Developing a Shared Vision Measuring Child well-being and Monitoring Progress - Ministerial Council on Social Policy Renewal*, 7 May 1999 [[http://unionsociale.gc.ca/nca/may7-speech\\_e.html](http://unionsociale.gc.ca/nca/may7-speech_e.html)]; Charlie Gillis, *Provinces Link Daycare to Health Funds: Ministers Won't Back Children's Agenda unit \$4.2 billion in Transfers Fully Restored* National Post, 10 June 2000; and Chantal Hebert, *Childcare Promises Signal Election Looming: The History*

---

***of Childcare Programs in Canada is that they have Tended to be Election Offerings that Disappear Once all the Votes are Counted, Hamilton Spectator, 9 June 2000.***

<sup>xxx</sup> Endnote 3 refers.

<sup>xxx</sup><sub>i</sub> The National Council of Welfare, ***Preschool Children: Promises to Keep***, Op.Cit., p. 38. This statistic is also cited in other sources.

<sup>xxx</sup><sub>ii</sub> Annex B shows that 10 percent of all childcare arrangements are regulated. There were a total of 516,734 such regulated positions in 1998 meaning that there is a shortage of approximately 4.5 million regulated spaces across the country. Figures from: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, ***Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998***, Op.Cit., pp. 96-97.

<sup>xxx</sup><sub>iii</sub> “*Anyone can legally operate a family child care home without becoming a regulated provider as long as they do not exceed the number of children permitted by the provincial or territorial legislation in their jurisdiction.*” See endnotes 8 and 54 and the discussion on pages 10-11. Unregulated in-home arrangements are supposed to meet specific standards with regard to the number of children under care; however, this is not monitored. As these arrangements tend to be informal, it is up to parents to monitor them to ensure that their children are being provided with a safe, secure and nurturing environment. Gillian Doherty et al, ***You Bet I Care (Vol III)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Regulated Family Child Care Across Canada***, p.123- 124. Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, ***Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998***, Op.Cit., p. 122 emphasizes the fact that: “*Most of the child care used by parents in the paid labour force is unregulated, not externally monitored and not funded except indirectly through income tax deductions or vouchers available to some parents. Little is known about these private arrangements including the quality of the care provided or relationships to early childhood programs.*”

<sup>xxx</sup><sub>iv</sub> ***The 1988 Canadian National Child Care Study*** noted, for example, that: “*less than half (45 per cent) of the pre-school children whose parents preferred licensed child care actually received it. The main reasons parents gave for not using the preferred licensed care were that it was not available (70 per cent), too expensive (22 per cent) or not suitable for parent’s working schedules (eight percent).*” From: Donna Lero et al [Statistics Canada], ***Parental Work Patterns and Child Care Needs: Canadian National Child Care Study*** (Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1992) as cited in Government of Canada (Minister of Human Resources Development), ***Improving Social Security in Canada – Child Care and Development: A Supplementary Paper***, Op.Cit., p.5.

<sup>xxx</sup><sub>v</sub> From: Donna Lero, Donna, ***Parental Work Patterns and Child Care Needs: Canadian National Child Care Study***, Op.Cit., as cited in ***Improving Social Security in Canada – Child Care and Development: A Supplementary Paper***, Op.Cit., p.14.

<sup>xxx</sup><sub>vi</sub> Many older children in this group become “latch key” kids responsible for their own before and after school care. This has significant QOL and safety repercussions. See Afterschool Alliance, ***Afterschool Alert: Poll Report***. (A Report of Findings from the 1999 Mott Foundation/JC Penney Nation wide Survey on Afterschool Programs) [Available from the Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto and at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]

<sup>xxx</sup><sub>vii</sub> Figures from: DHRIM Ad Hoc Statistical Report (*PeopleSoft*), compiled 14 March 2001



---

<sup>xxxviii</sup> Donna Lero et al [Statistics Canada], *Parental Work Patterns and Child Care Needs: Canadian National Child Care Study*, Op.Cit., p. 81. Over one-quarter of all parents who “off-scheduled” work did so because they could not afford other types of childcare. Ibid., p.84.

<sup>xxxix</sup> Source: DHRIM Ad Hoc Statistical Report (*Peoplesoft*), compiled 9 March 2001 (**Annex A** refers)

<sup>xl</sup> DND/CF (Land Forces Western Area HQ), *Land Forces Western Area Childcare Support Survey 1998* (Edmonton: CF – HQ Land Forces Western Area, 1998), Slide Presentation Package, Slide No. 30 entitled “Summary of Marital Parental Status Comparisons”

<sup>xli</sup> Ibid.

<sup>xlii</sup> This phenomenon is discussed in *The Minister’s Advisory Board on CF Gender Integration and Employment Equity – 2001 Report* [<http://www.dnd.ca/menu/press/Reports/CFGIEE/INDEX-E.HTM>], Section IVc and in Karen Davis, *Organizational Environment and Turnover: Understanding Women’s Exit From the Canadian Forces* (Thesis) (Montreal: McGill University, Dept of Sociology, 1994), p. 76.

<sup>xliii</sup> In the CF, life is much easier if the spouse, usually the wife, remains at home. Childcare is not a concern and it is easier to handle the stresses associated with postings, irregular work hours and deployments. However, within Canada, seven out of ten women with children under six are in the workplace. *Profiling Canada’s Families II*, (Vanier Institute of the Family, 2000) as cited in *You Bet I Care Fact Sheet!* (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org).) It is reasonable to assume that military spouses might be inclined to emulate this average if they had the opportunity to do so although the *SCONDVA Reports* highlights the fact that many spouses do not have the opportunity to work but would like to do so.

<sup>xliv</sup> See: Brenda Stewart, *Childcare for Single Parents* (Ottawa: VCDS Defense 2000/DGMRS, Apr/May 1998) [[www.vcds.dnd.ca](http://www.vcds.dnd.ca)]. While there are not CF statistics to document why service members leave the CF (footnote\* on page 9 refers), the US military found that childcare was a major factor in individuals leaving the forces. The Summary Report of the US House of Representatives Armed Services Committee Proceedings noted that: “[C]hild care is an important readiness and retention issue for military families: readiness because single parents and dual service couples must have access to affordable and quality child care if they are to perform their jobs...; retention because family dissatisfaction with military life – and particularly the inability of many spouses to establish careers or obtain suitable employment – is a primary reason trained military personnel leave the military.” Summary Report of the US House of Representatives Armed Services Committee Proceedings Numbers 101-121(1989) Cited in: Nancy Campbell, et al, *Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation’s Child Care System*, Op.Cit., p. 8. It is important to note that the childcare challenges experienced in the US are virtually identical to those being experienced in Canada and for similar reasons.

<sup>xlv</sup> Extrapolated from data that appears in **Annex A**.

<sup>xlvi</sup> *SCONDVA Report*, Op.Cit., Chap 5.

<sup>xlvii</sup> See endnote 43.

<sup>xlviii</sup> This is also the conclusion drawn by the LFWA Study. See endnote \* on page 12 which suggests that CF families cannot afford to pay more than they are now for childcare.

---

<sup>xlix</sup>For a description, see: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998*, Op.Cit., pp.36-37. “The \$5.00-a-day contribution entitles children to a maximum of ten hours a day of child care, one meal and two snacks and all the educational materials the children use at child care.” The implementation plan was to bring the plan on line in phases with the five and four-year olds being looked after first. “As of September 1998, all three-year olds [were to] ... also have \$5.00-a-day childcare. Care for younger children and infants and school-age children [was to be]... phased in and ...l be available for every child under 12 by September 2001.” While the media reports that waiting lists exist in some communities, Quebec is determined to ensure its plan is implemented and is working hard to meet its goal. The National Council of Welfare, *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep*, Op.Cit., pp. 40-41.

<sup>l</sup>DND/CF (Newsroom) *Quality of Life “Pillars”* (Ottawa: DND, 25 March 1999) [[http://www.dnd.ca/eng/archive/1999/mar99/25scondvareport\\_b\\_e.htm](http://www.dnd.ca/eng/archive/1999/mar99/25scondvareport_b_e.htm)]

<sup>li</sup> Most sources written since 1997 refer to the Quebec childcare system as a model to be emulated throughout the nation. Since the introduction of the new childcare program two-thirds of all childcare providers are required to have Early Childhood Education (ECE) training. However, even prior to 1997, Quebec’s standards for staff far exceeded the national average.

Hillel Goelman et al, *You Bet I Care (Vol II)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Child Care Centres Across Canada*, Op.Cit., Gillian Doherty et al, *You Bet I Care (Vol III)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Regulated Family Child Care Across Canada*, Op.Cit., Chap 6 and Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998*, Op.Cit., among other sources, discuss the determinants of quality care. Other factors also have an impact upon the quality of care including: the salaries and benefits of staff, hours worked, subsidization of rent and/or utilities, size and quality of play space available, the turnover rates of staff and whether the facility is non-profit or ‘for profit’. Non-profit centres generally provide a higher level of care than for profit centres. It is for this reason, among others, that the US military selected non-profit care as a model for its childcare centres (CDCs) as opposed to contracting out to “for profit” centres.

In many provinces, childcare workers are poorly paid. See: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998*, Op.Cit., p. 115. This results in a high turnover rate and poorly qualified persons entering the field. Within Canada, staff turnover rates in childcare centres average 21.7% per year. Alberta has the highest turnover rate at 44.8%. This is a concern because a high turnover rate prevents children from forming lasting relationships with qualified care providers, which is an important element in early childhood development. Hillel Goelman et al, *You Bet I Care (Vol II)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Child Care Centres Across Canada*, Op.Cit., xxi and Chap 6. Nancy Campbell et al (National Women’s Law Centre), *Be All*

---

***That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation's Child Care System, Op.Cit., pp.15-16.***

- <sup>lii</sup> In the case of New Brunswick, Yukon and the Northwest Territory, not even childcare centre directors are required to have ECE training. **Annex C** refers.
- <sup>liii</sup> “A survey of the Childcare Resource and Research Unit found that no Canadian provincial jurisdiction met the levels of desirable practice supported by the research ...for all child ranges.” For example, the desirable ratio of two-year old children to staff members is 4:1. For younger children the desired ratio is 3:1. Gillian Doherty, ***Standards of Practice and Quality Child Care***, p. 2 [Except Available from: Canadian Child Care Federation at <http://netwinder.cfc-efc.ca>]
- <sup>liv</sup> Hillel Goelman et al, ***You Bet I Care (Vol II)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Child Care Centres Across Canada, Op.Cit.***
- <sup>lv</sup> Gillian Doherty et al, ***You Bet I Care (Vol III)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Regulated Family Child Care Across Canada, Op.Cit.*** records the following statistics in the executive summary:

**QUALITY OF CARE PROVIDED IN  
CANADIAN IN-HOME CARE FACILITIES**

Standard of Care	Percentage of Regulated Homes
Inadequate to minimal custodial care	7.8
Minimal custodial to custodial care	23.8
Good custodial care	31.6
Care that “stimulates development”	36.8

- <sup>lvi</sup> Martha Friendly, ***What is the Public Interest in Child Care?*** Op.Cit., p.3. A US study also provides interesting information. See: Karen Schulman [Children’s Defense Fund 2000], ***The High Cost of Child Care Puts Quality Out of Reach for Many Families*** (Washington: Children’s Defense Fund, 2000).
- <sup>lvii</sup> The best forms of unregulated care are very expensive. A trained (ECE) nanny in most major Canadian cities commands a minimum salary of eight dollars an hour (ten dollars for overtime past eight hours of work). This is not affordable to most military families. HRDC provides a recommended salary scale to individuals taking part in the *Live-In Care Giver Program*. It specifies that salaries should range from \$7.50 - \$10.00 per hour for nannies looking after one pre-school child to \$9.00 to \$10.00 per hour for nannies looking after 3 pre-school children or more than three children under 13. (“Suggested Wage Rates” HRDC information package, *Live-In Care Giver Program*). In large cities, the higher range of the scale is the norm for nannies already working in the country. Wages for nannies brought from overseas tend to be somewhat lower. Unfortunately, many of the individuals passing themselves off as “nannies” have no ECE education or even first aid training. Yet, due to the shortage of childcare in major Canadian cities, they are often able to demand top dollar. For example, during the week of 10-11 March 2001, I interviewed four allegedly qualified “nannies” sent from a reputable agency in Toronto. None were ECE qualified. Only one had undergone first aid training. Their salary demands ranged from \$10.00/hour to \$12.50/hour.
- <sup>lviii</sup> A study of federal and provincial child tax credit policy was commissioned by the QOL Project/NDHQ, ***Commissioned Study on Child Tax Benefits (Federal and Provincial)***, Appendix 1 [Copy available from the QOL Project/NDHQ]
- <sup>lix</sup> Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, ***Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998, Op.Cit.***, p. 128

---

<sup>lx</sup> The Post Living Differential (PLD) is designed to address “*the difference in overall cost of living between the CF average in Canada and higher cost locations where members have their principle residence.*” Web document entitled “*Post Living Differential*” [[http://www.dnd.ca/QOL/engraph/cmpl\\_e.asp](http://www.dnd.ca/QOL/engraph/cmpl_e.asp)]

<sup>lxi</sup> Analysis based on 1992 childcare costs shows that, due to childcare subsidies “*although nominal [childcare] fees for the hypothetical two children [used in the model] do not vary much between the four provinces [studies] (they range between \$8,724 and \$9,320), the net cost to parents across the [four] provinces [compared in the study] does vary, sometimes by a substantial amount.*” For example, in 1992, due to the inequitable application of subsidies, net childcare costs were “up to” \$2,000 per year more for a family with two children in Saskatchewan than they were for a similar family in Quebec. Since the introduction of the Quebec universal childcare program, the difference in cost is even greater. **Annex D** refers. Gillian Doherty, et al, *Child Care: Canada Can’t Work Without It*, Op.Cit., p. 29

<sup>lxii</sup> Documentation available from Director Pay Policy Development (DPPD) of the Director General Compensation and Benefits entitled “General Methodology” describes the basis upon which PLD is calculated. Further information regarding what specific items are included under “*domestic service and childcare*” was provided by DPPD in an e-mail.

<sup>lxiii</sup> Ibid.

<sup>lxiv</sup> **SCONDVA Report**, Op.Cit., Chap 5. The aim of the first recommendation was to ensure that: “*Child care will be provided by a parent, a relative, a child care centre or through other arrangements while deployments occur. It also reassures commanders because they know that members of their units have made arrangements for child care and will not be preoccupied by family requirements when they have to deploy.*”

While the Report acknowledged the US military childcare system, it made no specific recommendations for the creation of a similar system within the CF. Instead, it noted that “*Treasury Board policies prevent the use of federal public funds to subsidize childcare costs.*” This runs contrary to the information provided in **DMFS Guideline No 14, Relationship Between Military Family Resource Centres and Daycare Centres**, January 2000, which permits base commanders to support on-site childcare centres located on their bases with public funds. Some chose to do so subsidizing infrastructure, utility and other miscellaneous costs. Moreover, with regard to the **SCONDVA Report’s** comments, Treasury Board policies can be changed if the will exists to do so.

<sup>lxv</sup> **LFWA Study (Data Analysis Report)**, Op.Cit., p. 5.

<sup>lxvi</sup> CANFORGEN 74/00 151604Z Jun 00, **Family Care Assistance (FCA)**

<sup>lxvii</sup> DND/CF (Human Resources – Military Family Services), *Deployment and emergency Childcare Service* (Ottawa: DND, nd) [[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/cfpsa/dmfs/Engraph/child\\_e.asp](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/cfpsa/dmfs/Engraph/child_e.asp)], p. 1

<sup>lxviii</sup> Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>lxix</sup> **DMFS Guideline No 14**, Op.Cit., p. 1.

<sup>lxx</sup> Ibid., pp. 1-2.

<sup>lxxi</sup> Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>lxxii</sup> Nancy Campbell (National Women’s Law Centre, **Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation’s Child Care System**, Op.Cit., p. 3.

<sup>lxxiii</sup> The description of the US military childcare system that appears in this section of the essay is taken from the following sources, all of which provide similar general information:

- Nancy Campbell (National Women’s Law Centre), **Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation’s Child Care System**, Op.Cit.

- 
- United States Accounting Office, Report to Congressional Requesters, *Child Care – How do Military and Civilian Centre Costs Compare?*, Op.Cit
  - Linda Kozaryn, *DoD Child Care Leads Way* (GovExec.com (Daily Briefing), 29 Apr 1997) [<http://www.governmentexecutive.com/dailyfed/0497/042997+1.htm>]
  - Linda Kozaryn, *It's a New World Sarge!* [<http://www.defenselink.mil/specials/childcare/main/htm>]
  - *Military Children and Youth – Frequently Asked Questions* [[http://militarychildrenandyouth.calib.com/mm\\_faq.htm](http://militarychildrenandyouth.calib.com/mm_faq.htm)]
  - Military Children and Youth, *Overview of Military Child Development System* [[http://military-childrenandyouth.calib.com/mm\\_cdc.htm](http://military-childrenandyouth.calib.com/mm_cdc.htm)]
  - Military Family Resource Centre, *Military Families Staying in Step in the 1990's* (Arlington, VA: Military Family Resource Centre, November 1998)
  - Rand Research Brief, *The Armed Services' Response to the Military Child Care Act*, (RAND, 1998) [<http://www.rand.org/publications/RB/RB7521/>]

<sup>lxxiv</sup> Nancy Campbell (National Women's Law Centre), *Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation's Child Care System*, Op.Cit., p. 3.

<sup>lxxv</sup> United States Accounting Office, Report to Congressional Requesters, *Child Care – How do Military and Civilian Centre Costs Compare?*, Op.Cit., p. 7.

<sup>lxxvi</sup> Ibid., p.8.

<sup>lxxvii</sup> Nancy Campbell (National Women's Law Centre), *Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation's Child Care System*, Op.Cit., p. 15.

<sup>lxxviii</sup> Nancy Campbell (National Women's Law Centre), *Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation's Child Care System*, Op.Cit., p. pp.2 and Chap 3 notes that 95% met the higher education accreditation standards of the National Association for the Education of Younger Children (NAEYC). Canadian organizations have also created standards for quality childcare. See, for example, *National Statement on Quality Childcare* (Canadian Child Care Federation, August 1991) [<http://netwinder.cfc-efc.ca>]

<sup>lxxix</sup> The US military CDC workers were actually made public servants. Along with the certification program, this has ensured that a cadre of professional childcare workers has been created which further improves the quality of the childcare centres that serve the military community. Refer to endnote 51 for a brief discussion of the correlation between childcare worker turnover rates and quality care.

<sup>lxxx</sup> Nancy Campbell (National Women's Law Centre), *Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation's Child Care System*, Op.Cit., p. 18.

<sup>lxxxii</sup> Nancy Campbell (National Women's Law Centre), *Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation's Child Care System*, Op.Cit., p. 17.

**ANNEX B – AVAILABILITY OF CHILDCARE SPACES ACROSS CANADA BY TYPE  
AND PROVINCE (1998)**

<b>Province / Territory</b>	<b>Centre (full &amp; part time)</b>	<b>Regulated School-Age Care</b>	<b>Regulated In Home Care</b>	<b>Total Regulated Spaces</b>	<b>Percentage of C 0-12 for Whom T A Regulated S</b>
BC	35,217	16,404	17,357	68,978	10.8
<b>Alta</b>	40,528	Not regulated in Alta	6,505	47,033	8.8
<b>Sask</b>	3,970	919	2,234	7,124	3.9
<b>Man</b>	13,104	3,897	3,489	20,490	10.5
<b>Ont</b>	148,947 (est)	Figures not aval	18,143	167,090	8.5
<b>Que**</b>	60,541	92,700	21,761	175,002	14.9**
<b>NB</b>	9,048	N/A	156	9,204	7.7
<b>NS</b>	10,994	N/A	169	11,163	7.3
<b>PEI</b>	3,196	482	39	3,717	15.4
<b>Nfdl &amp; Lab</b>	3,740	535	N/A	4,275	5.0
<b>NWT</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,307	N/A
<b>Yukon</b>	665	226	416	1,307	N/A
<b>TOTAL</b>	329,950	155,163	70,270	516,734	<b>10</b>

\*\*Note: Since the introduction of the universal childcare system in Quebec, this figure is no longer accurate. It may be assumed that the percentage of regulated spaces would be far higher.

Source: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998* (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, 1998), pp. 96-97.

**ANNEX C – CHILD CARE CENTRE STANDARDS AND IN-HOME CARE STANDARDS BY PROVINCE (1988)**

**CHILD CARE CENTRE STANDARDS**

Prov	Ratio	Group Size	ECE Training	First Aid Trg	M
<b>BC</b>	<b>0-3 yrs - 1:4</b> <b>30 mos-6yrs - 1:8</b>	12 25	<b>Under age 36 mos:</b> Each gp of 5-8 children must have one infant/toddler educator (basic 10-mo ECCE program plus specialized infant/toddler training) and one early childhood educator (at least 10-mo ECCE education from an approved institution. Each gp of 9-12 children requires one infant/toddler educator, one early childhood educator and one assistant. <b>36 mos to school age:</b> Each gp requires one early childhood educator plus assistants.	Not specified in sources.	Annual vi a statutory requireme
<b>Alta</b>	<b>0-12 mos – 1:3</b> <b>13-18 mos - 1:4</b> <b>19-35 mos- 1:6</b> <b>3-4.11yrs – 1:8</b> <b>5-6 yrs – 1:10</b>	6 8 12 16 20	<b>Directors</b> are required to have a two-year ECCE diploma or equivalent. <b>One in four staff</b> must have a one-year ECCE credential or equivalent. <b>All other teaching staff</b> must take a 50-hour child care orientation course from a community college or equivalent.	Not specified in sources.	Quarterly not a statu requireme
<b>Sask</b>	<b>Infants - 1:3</b> <b>Toddlers – 1:5</b> <b>30 mos-6yrs –1:10</b>	6 10 20	<b>Supervisors</b> must have a one-year certificate or equivalent. <b>Every other staff member</b> must take a 130-hour child care orientation course or equivalent provided through a community college within one year of commencing work unless the person has a one-year ECCE certificate or equivalent.	One staff member in each centre must have a completed first aid course.	A minimu annually. not a statu requireme
<b>Man</b>	<b>0-2 yrs – 1:6</b> <b>2-4 yrs – 1:9</b> <b>4-6 yrs –1:15</b>	12 18 30	<b>Two-thirds of full-time preschool staff</b> must be classified as ECEII or III and school-age centre and nursery school staff must be classified as ECE II or III. <b>Directors</b> must have an appropriate ECE qual to the age of the children and have 1 year's experience as a childcare provider.	First aid and CPR mandatory for all staff.	Not specif

### CHILD CARE CENTRE STANDARDS

<b>Ont</b>	<b>birth–17mos –3:10</b> <b>18mos-2.5yrs-1:5</b> <b>2.5-4.11 yrs - 1:8</b> <b>5-6yrs – 1:12</b>	10 15 16 24	<b>Supervisors</b> must have a two-yr ECCE diploma or equivalent and at least two-year's experience working in child care. <b>One staff person with each group</b> must have a two-year ECCE diploma or equivalent.	Not specified in sources.	Annual vi policy. No requireme
<b>Que</b>	<b>birth–17mos –1:5</b> <b>18mos- 3 yrs- 1:8</b> <b>4-5 yrs - 1:10</b> <b>6 – 12 yrs – 1:15</b>	15 30 30 30	<b>One third of staff</b> must have a college diploma or university degree in ECCE.	Not specified in sources.	Permits an years. Th or statutor for the fre
<b>NB</b>	<b>Less than 2 –1:3</b> <b>2-2.11 yrs- 1:5</b> <b>3-3.11 yrs - 1:7</b> <b>4 –4.11 yrs – 1:10</b> <b>5-5.11yrs – 1:12</b>	9 10 14 20 24	<b>No statutory policy requirements for ECCE education for either directors or teaching staff.</b>	First aid training required.	One annua statutory r Also cond unannoun year.
<b>NS</b>	<b>0-2 yrs –1:7</b> <b>2-4 yrs – 1:7</b> <b>4-6 yrs –1:15</b>	N/A	<b>Centre director and two-thirds of staff</b> must have a 1 or 2 – year ECE certificate or diploma or 2 years experience, one course and a 35-hour workshop on child development and curriculum.	First aid training required.	Not specif

<b>PEI</b>	<b>0-2 yrs –1:5 2-4 yrs – 1:10 4-6 yrs –1:12</b>	N/A	<b>Centre supervisors and one full-time staff member in each program</b> must have a 1 or 2 – year early childhood development diploma or university child study degree. 30 hours of in-service training every three years is required for <b>all staff.</b>	<b>Not specified in sources</b>	Not specif
<b>Nfdl</b>	<b>0-2 yrs –1:6 2-4 yrs – 1:8 4-6 yrs –1:8</b>	25 25 25	<b>Centre supervisors</b> must have a 1 year certificate in ECE and 1 year in a licensed centre or a two-year diploma with no specifications regarding experience. <b>I. Staff: No ECE requirements</b>	<b>Not specified in sources</b>	Not specif

### CHILD CARE CENTRE STANDARDS

<b>Yukon</b>	<b>0-18 mos - 1:4 18 mos-2.11yrs – 1:6 3 yrs-5.11yrs – 1:8</b>	12 16 24	<b>Fifty per cent of staff</b> must have completed at least a 60-hour child care orientation. In 1999, this requirement was increased.	One care giver must be first aid qualified.	One annual statutory r do 3 to 5 u visits each
<b>NWT</b>	<b>0-2 yrs –1:6 2-4 yrs – 1:9 4-6 yrs –1:10</b>	12 18 20	<b>No ECE requirements.</b>	Staff must have a first aid certificate.	Not specif

Sources: Hillel Goelman et al, *You Bet I Care (Vol II)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Child Care Centres Across Canada* (Guelph, Ont: University of Guelph, 2000). Appendix A, pp. 93-95 and Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998* (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, 1998), pp. 102 – 103 and 111 – 113.

### IN HOME CARE STANDARDS

Prov	ECE Training/Experience	First Aid Trg	Monitoring
<b>BC</b>	Nil	Certificate	Not specified in sources
<b>Alta</b>	Nil	Nil	Not specified in sources
<b>Sask</b>	Orientation session plus two development work shops each licensing year	First aid training	Not specified in sources
<b>Man</b>	Nil	Valid certificate with CPR	Not specified in sources



<b>On</b>	Nil	First aid certificate only if working with special need children	Not specified in sources
<b>Que</b>	Complete 45 hour training program.	First aid certificate	Not specified in sources
<b>NB</b>	Nil.	First aid training.	Not specified in sources
<b>NS</b>	Nil (criminal check mandatory)	Nil	Not specified in sources
<b>PEI</b>	30 hour training program, two letters of reference	<b>Current first-aid certificate</b>	Not specified in sources
<b>Nfdl&amp; Lab</b>	II. N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Yukon</b>	60 hour introductory course, a specific family day home course or equivalent within the first year	First aid certificate	Not specified in sources
<b>NWT</b>	<b>Nil</b>	First aid certificate	Not specified in sources

Source: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998* (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, 1998), p. 111.

**ANNEX C – CHILD CARE CENTRE STANDARDS AND IN-HOME CARE STANDARDS BY PROVINCE (1988)**

**CHILD CARE CENTRE STANDARDS**

Prov	Ratio	Group Size	ECE Training	First Aid Trg	M
<b>BC</b>	<b>0-3 yrs - 1:4</b> <b>30 mos-6yrs - 1:8</b>	12 25	<b>Under age 36 mos:</b> Each gp of 5-8 children must have one infant/toddler educator (basic 10-mo ECCE program plus specialized infant/toddler training) and one early childhood educator (at least 10-mo ECCE education from an approved institution. Each gp of 9-12 children requires one infant/toddler educator, one early childhood educator and one assistant. <b>36 mos to school age:</b> Each gp requires one early childhood educator plus assistants.	Not specified in sources.	Annual via a statutory requireme
<b>Alta</b>	<b>0-12 mos – 1:3</b> <b>13-18 mos - 1:4</b> <b>19-35 mos- 1:6</b> <b>3-4.11yrs – 1:8</b> <b>5-6 yrs – 1:10</b>	6 8 12 16 20	<b>Directors</b> are required to have a two-year ECCE diploma or equivalent. <b>One in four staff</b> must have a one-year ECCE credential or equivalent. <b>All other teaching staff</b> must take a 50-hour child care orientation course from a community college or equivalent.	Not specified in sources.	Quarterly not a statu requireme

<b>Sask</b>	<b>Infants - 1:3</b> <b>Toddlers – 1:5</b> <b>30 mos-6yrs –1:10</b>	6 10 20	<b>Supervisors</b> must have a one-year certificate or equivalent. <b>Every other staff member</b> must take a 130-hour child care orientation course or equivalent provided through a community college within one year of commencing work unless the person has a one-year ECCE certificate or equivalent.	One staff member in each centre must have a completed first aid course.	A minimum annually. not a statutory requirement
<b>Man</b>	<b>0-2 yrs – 1:6</b> <b>2-4 yrs – 1:9</b> <b>4-6 yrs –1:15</b>	12 18 30	<b>Two-thirds of full-time preschool staff</b> must be classified as ECEII or III and school-age centre and nursery school staff must be classified as ECE II or III. <b>Directors</b> must have an appropriate ECE qual to the age of the children and have 1 year's experience as a childcare provider.	First aid and CPR mandatory for all staff.	Not specified

### CHILD CARE CENTRE STANDARDS

<b>Ont</b>	<b>birth–17mos –3:10</b> <b>18mos-2.5yrs-1:5</b> <b>2.5-4.11 yrs - 1:8</b> <b>5-6yrs – 1:12</b>	10 15 16 24	<b>Supervisors</b> must have a two-yr ECCE diploma or equivalent and at least two-year's experience working in child care. <b>One staff person with each group</b> must have a two-year ECCE diploma or equivalent.	Not specified in sources.	Annual visitation policy. No requirements
<b>Que</b>	<b>birth–17mos –1:5</b> <b>18mos- 3 yrs- 1:8</b> <b>4-5 yrs - 1:10</b> <b>6 – 12 yrs – 1:15</b>	15 30 30 30	<b>One third of staff</b> must have a college diploma or university degree in ECCE.	Not specified in sources.	Permits an annual visitation. The or statutory requirements for the free
<b>NB</b>	<b>Less than 2 –1:3</b> <b>2-2.11 yrs- 1:5</b> <b>3-3.11 yrs - 1:7</b> <b>4 –4.11 yrs – 1:10</b> <b>5-5.11yrs – 1:12</b>	9 10 14 20 24	<b>No statutory policy requirements for ECCE education for either directors or teaching staff.</b>	First aid training required.	One annual visitation. Also conduct unannounced annual visitation.
<b>NS</b>	<b>0-2 yrs –1:7</b> <b>2-4 yrs – 1:7</b> <b>4-6 yrs –1:15</b>	N/A	<b>Centre director and two-thirds of staff</b> must have a 1 or 2 – year ECE certificate or diploma or 2 years experience, one course and a 35-hour workshop on child development and curriculum.	First aid training required.	Not specified
<b>PEI</b>	<b>0-2 yrs –1:5</b> <b>2-4 yrs – 1:10</b> <b>4-6 yrs –1:12</b>	N/A	<b>Centre supervisors and one full-time staff member in each program</b> must have a 1 or 2 – year early childhood development diploma or university child study degree. 30 hours of in-service training every three years is required for <b>all staff.</b>	<b>Not specified in sources</b>	Not specified
<b>Nfdl</b>	<b>0-2 yrs –1:6</b> <b>2-4 yrs – 1:8</b> <b>4-6 yrs –1:8</b>	25 25 25	<b>Centre supervisors</b> must have a 1 year certificate in ECE and 1 year in a licensed centre or a two-year diploma with no specifications regarding experience. <b>III. Staff: No ECE requirements</b>	Not specified in sources	Not specified

### CHILD CARE CENTRE STANDARDS

<b>Yukon</b>	<b>0-18 mos - 1:4</b> <b>18 mos-2.11yrs – 1:6</b> <b>3 yrs-5.11yrs – 1:8</b>	12 16 24	<b>Fifty per cent of staff</b> must have completed at least a 60-hour child care orientation. In 1999, this requirement was increased.	One care giver must be first aid qualified.	One annual statutory r do 3 to 5 u visits each
<b>NWT</b>	<b>0-2 yrs –1:6</b> <b>2-4 yrs – 1:9</b> <b>4-6 yrs –1:10</b>	12 18 20	<b>No ECE requirements.</b>	Staff must have a first aid certificate.	Not specif

Sources: Hillel Goelman et al, *You Bet I Care (Vol II)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Child Care Centres Across Canada* (Guelph, Ont: University of Guelph, 2000). Appendix A, pp. 93-95 and Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998* (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, 1998), pp. 102 – 103 and 111 – 113.

### IN HOME CARE STANDARDS

Prov	ECE Training/Experience	First Aid Trg	Monitoring
<b>BC</b>	Nil	Certificate	Not specified in sources
<b>Alta</b>	Nil	Nil	Not specified in sources
<b>Sask</b>	Orientation session plus two development work shops each licensing year	First aid training	Not specified in sources
<b>Man</b>	Nil	Valid certificate with CPR	Not specified in sources
<b>On</b>	Nil	First aid certificate only if working with special need children	Not specified in sources
<b>Que</b>	Complete 45 hour training program.	First aid certificate	Not specified in sources
<b>NB</b>	Nil.	First aid training.	Not specified in sources
<b>NS</b>	Nil (criminal check mandatory)	Nil	Not specified in sources
<b>PEI</b>	30 hour training program, two letters of reference	<b>Current first-aid certificate</b>	Not specified in sources
<b>Nfdl&amp; Lab</b>	IV. N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Yukon</b>	60 hour introductory course, a specific family day home course or equivalent within the first year	First aid certificate	Not specified in sources
<b>NWT</b>	Nil	First aid certificate	Not specified in sources

Source: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998* (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, 1998), p. 111.

**ANNEX D – MEDIAN MONTHLY FEES FOR FULL-TIME CENTRE-BASED CARE (1998)**

<b>Prov/Territory</b>	<b>Infant \$</b>	<b>Toddler \$</b>	<b>Pre-School \$</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>BC</b>	650	547	46	Childcare tends to be significantly more expensive in large centres
<b>Alberta</b>	525	450	425	
<b>Saskatchewan</b>	Not reportable due to sample size	405	380	
<b>Manitoba</b>	573	383	368	
<b>Ontario</b>	783	603	541	Childcare tends to be significantly more expensive in large centres
<b>Quebec</b>	477 - pre-2000*  100**	455 - pre-2000*  100**	440 - pre-2000*  100**	*avg rate before the introduction of the \$5.00-per-child-per-day universal plan **current cost
<b>New Brunswick</b>	380	360	360	
<b>Nova Scotia</b>	470	412	412	
<b>PEI</b>	440	412	412	
<b>Newfoundland &amp; Labrador</b>	not reportable due to sample size	380	360	
<b>Yukon</b>	630	550	514	
<b>Northwest Territories</b>	Not reportable due to sample size	Not reportable due to sample size	not reportable due to sample size	
<b>AVERAGE</b>	531	477	455	

Source: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998* (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, 1998), p. 107

**ANNEX E – INCOME ELIGIBILITY LEVELS FOR FULL AND PARTIAL CHILD CARE FEE SUBSIDIES (1998)**

<b>Province/ Territory</b>	<b>Family Size</b>	<b>Full Subsidy Up To \$</b>	<b>Partial Subsidy Up To</b>	<b>Low Income Cut-Off*</b>
<b>BC</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	18,984 23,016	27,816 31,846	24,175 (3 pers household)
<b>Alta</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	20,520 24,120	30,720 45,720	25,095 (3 pers household)
<b>Sask</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	19,668 20,868	31,920 45,720	21,831 (3 pers household)
<b>Man</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	13,787 18,895	24,369 40,059	29,730 (4 pers household)
<b>Ont</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	29,524 (4 pers household)
<b>Que**</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	12,000** 16,800**	35,800** 40,300**	24,714 (3 pers household)**
<b>NB</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	15,000 15,000	23,100 24,180	20,708 (3 pers household)
<b>NS</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	16,812 17,712	24,540 34,092	21,519 (3 pers household)
<b>PEI</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	13,440 19,200	25,440 40,800	23,772 (4 pers household)
<b>Nfdl &amp; Lab</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	9,960 11,040	18,240 19,320	25,668 (4 pers household)
<b>Yukon</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	17,772 26,172	28,572 47,772	N/A
<b>NWT</b>	1 parent, 1 child 2 parents, 2 children	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A

\* Low income cut-offs “are based on income after government transfer payments such as the Canada Child Tax Benefit, Old Age Security Pension, GST credit, EI benefits and welfare payments but before all federal and provincial taxes are deducted.

\*\* **Has changed since 1998 due to introduction of universal \$5.00-per-child-per-day childcare system. Now all families have access to subsidized childcare spaces regardless of salary.** Further subsidies are available to low-income families in Quebec that reduce the cost of childcare to a minimum of \$2.00-per-child-per-day.

Source: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998* (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, 1998), p. 105.

**ANNEX F – MEDIAN MONTHLY FEES FOR FULL-TIME CENTRE-BASED CARE  
(1998) VS PLD RATES PAID ACROSS CANADA**

<b>Prov/Territory</b>	<b>Infant</b> \$ per month	<b>Toddler</b> \$ per month	<b>Pre-School</b> \$ per month	<b>PLD Rate</b> \$ per month
<b>BC</b>	650.	547	46	Victoria – 498 Vancouver – 750 Aldergrove – 387 Chilliwack – 69
<b>Alberta</b>	525	450	425	Calgary – 177 Edmonton – 11
<b>Saskatchewan</b>	Not reportable due to sample size	405	380	Dundurn - 22
<b>Manitoba</b>	573	383	368	Winnipeg – 123 Shilo – 57
<b>Ontario</b>	783	603	541	Toronto – 948 Hamilton – 299 Windsor – 334 London – 175 Barrie/Borden – 106 North Bay – 86 Sudbury – 80 Thunderbay – 85 Ottawa/Hull - 114
<b>Quebec</b>	*477 - pre-2000  *100 – current rate	*455 - pre-2000  *100 – current rate	*440 – pre-2000  *100 – current rate	Montreal – 446 St Jean – 178 Sherbrooke – 165 Quebec City – 98
<b>New Brunswick</b>	380	360	360	Nil
<b>Nova Scotia</b>	470	412	412	Nil
<b>PEI</b>	440	412	412	Nil
<b>Newfoundland &amp; Labrador</b>	not reportable due to sample size	380	360	St John's - 193
<b>Yukon</b>	630	550	514	
<b>Northwest Territories</b>	Not reportable due to sample size	Not reportable due to sample size	not reportable due to sample size	
<b>AVERAGE</b>	531	477	455	

\* Quebec rate prior to the introduction of the universal childcare program

\*\*Quebec rate based on new universal childcare program (\$5.00-per-child-per-day rate)

---

Source: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998* (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, 1998), p. 107 and *CANFORGEN 072/00*, 151602Z Jun 00

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. DND PUBLICATIONS

CANFORGEN 074/00, 151604Z Jun 00, *Family Care Assistance(FCA)*

CANFORGEN 072/00, 151602Z Jun 00, *Post Living Differential (PLD)*

DAOD 5001-2, *Families*

Davis, Karen, *Organizational Environment and Turnover: Understanding Women's Exit From the Canadian Forces* (Thesis) (Montreal: McGill University, Dept of Sociology, 1994)

DND/CF (Human Resources), *Family Care Assistance(FCA)* (Ottawa: DND, nd)  
[\[http://hr.dwan.dnd.ca/qol/engraph/fam9-e.asp\]](http://hr.dwan.dnd.ca/qol/engraph/fam9-e.asp)

DHRIM Ad Hoc Statistical Report, *Number of Married, Married Service Couple, Single, Common Law Service Members by Rank and Gender*, compiled 9 March 2001

DHRIM Ad Hoc Statistical Report, *Number of Children of Married, Married Service Couple, Single, Common Law Service Members by Rank and Gender*, compiled 14 March 2001

DMFS Guideline No 14, *Relationship Between Military Family Resource Centres and Daycare Centres*, January 2000

DND/CF (Human Resources - Directorate of Strategic Human Resource Analysis - DSHRA), *The Changing Nature of Work* (Ottawa: DND/CF, March 1998)  
[\[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/dshra/engraph/newsletter/nature\\_e.asp\]](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/dshra/engraph/newsletter/nature_e.asp)

DND/CF (Human Resources - Directorate of Strategic Human Resource Analysis - DSHRA), *The Canadian Family* (Ottawa: DND/CF, January 1998)  
[\[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/dshra/engraph/newsletter/family\\_e.asp\]](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/dshra/engraph/newsletter/family_e.asp)

DND/CF (Human Resources -Directorate of Strategic Human Resource Analysis - DSHRA), *Canada's Evolving Population* (Ottawa: DND/CF, December 1997)  
[\[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/dshra/engraph/newsletter/family\\_e.asp\]](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/dshra/engraph/newsletter/family_e.asp)

DND/CF (Human Resources - Military Family Services), *Deployment and Emergency Childcare Service* (Ottawa: DND, nd)  
[\[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/cfpa/dmfs/Engraph/child\\_e.asp\]](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/cfpa/dmfs/Engraph/child_e.asp)

---

DND/CF (Human Resources - Military Family Services), **Director Military Family Services – Operational Guidelines**, 29 October 1993

DND/CF (Human Resources/QOL), **QOL Initiatives Progress Chart – Family Support**  
[[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/qol/engraph/Apfam\\_e.asp](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/qol/engraph/Apfam_e.asp)]

DND/CF (Human Resources/QOL), **Commissioned Study on Child Tax Benefits (Federal and Provincial), Appendix 1** [Copy available from the QOL Project/NDHQ]

DND/CF (Human Resources), **Post Living Differential (PLD)** (description) [[www.dnd.ca/hr](http://www.dnd.ca/hr)]

DND/CF (Land Forces Western Area HQ), **Land Forces Western Area Childcare Support Survey 1998 and Data Analysis Report** (Edmonton: CF – HQ Land Forces Western Area, 1998)

DND/CF (Newsroom), **Quality of Life “Pillars”** (Ottawa: DND, 25 March 1999)  
[[http://www.dnd.ca/eng/archive/1999/mar99/25scondvareport\\_b\\_e.htm](http://www.dnd.ca/eng/archive/1999/mar99/25scondvareport_b_e.htm)]

DND/CF (VCDS), **Defence Planning Guidance 2001** (Ottawa: DND, 2001)  
[[http://www.vcds.dnd.ca/dgsp/dpg/dpg2001/chap2\\_e.asp](http://www.vcds.dnd.ca/dgsp/dpg/dpg2001/chap2_e.asp)]

Departmental document on Post Living Differential (PLD) entitled “General Methodology”  
[Available from Director Pay Policy Development/Director General Compensation and Benefits/NDHQ]

DND/CF (Human resources - SCONDVA), **Interim Report On Quality of Life in the Canadian Forces** [[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/Scondva/engraph/intfam\\_e.asp](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/Scondva/engraph/intfam_e.asp)]

Lee, Catherine C. (DCHRP), **Economic Viability Study on Workplace Day Care Centre**  
(Ottawa: NDHQ/ Directorate of Civilian Human Resource Planning (DCHRP), 20 September 1993)

Lee, Catherine, **Needs Analysis Report on Workplace Daycare Centre(s) and Information and Referral Services for Child and Elder Care** (Ottawa: NDHQ/DCHRP, 21 July 1993)

**The Minister’s Advisory Board on CF Gender Integration and Employment Equity – 2001 Report** [<http://www.dnd.ca/menu/press/Reports/CFGIEE/INDEX-E.HTM>]

Perron, Capt N.M., **Hey, What About Us? Single-Friendly Policy Project** (Ottawa: DND/ Director Human Resources Research and Evaluation (DHRRE), May 2000)

QR&O 209.335, **Family Care Assistance (FCA)**

Stewart, Brenda, **Childcare for Single Parents** (Ottawa: VCDS/DGMRS, Apr/May 1998)  
[[www.vcds.dnd.ca](http://www.vcds.dnd.ca)]



---

Tanner, Leesa M, *DND Daycare Needs Analysis for the National Capital Region* (Ottawa: DND/DHRRE, 2001)

*2000 Annual Report to SCONDVA on QOL in the CF*  
[[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/scondva/engraph/fam\\_e.asp](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/scondva/engraph/fam_e.asp)]

## II. GOVERNMENT OF CANADA PUBLICATIONS

*Background Information on the National Child Benefit System Announced in the Speech from the Throne* September 23, 1997 [[http://socialunion.gc.ca/news/dia210600\\_e.html](http://socialunion.gc.ca/news/dia210600_e.html)]

Government of Canada (Statistics Canada), *Women in Canada 2000* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2000)

Government of Canada (Minister of Human Resources Development), *Improving Social Security in Canada – Child Care and Development: A Supplementary Paper* (Ottawa: Government of Canada (Minister of Supply and Services), 1994)

Human Resources Development Canada (news release), *What Canadians are Telling Us About the National Children's Agenda*, 21 June 2000 [<http://www.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/common/news/hmib/00-42.shtml>]

Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) information provided to *Live-In Caregiver Program* employers [Photocopy available at HRDC offices]

Lero, Donna et al (Statistics Canada), *Parental Work Patterns and Child Care Needs: Canadian National Child Care Study* (Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1992)

National Council of Welfare, *Preschool Children: Promises to Keep* (Ottawa: National Council of Welfare, 1999)

Pettigrew, Pierre, Notes for an Address by The Honorable Pierre Pettigrew, Min of Human Resources Development Canada, *A National Children's Agenda: Developing a Shared Vision Measuring Child Well-being and Monitoring Progress- Ministerial Council on Social Policy Renewal*, 7 May 1999 [[http://unionsociale.gc.ca/nca/may7-speech\\_e.html](http://unionsociale.gc.ca/nca/may7-speech_e.html)]

Privy Council Office (Intergovernmental Affairs), *Social Union, A Framework to Improve the Social Union for Canadians: An Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Governments of the Provinces and Territories, February 4 1999* [<http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/aia/english/viewd...english/perspective/canada/socialunion.htm>]

*Public Dialogue on the National Children's Agenda – Developing a Shared Vision* (Government of Canada), [[http://socialunion.gc.ca/nca/June21-2000/english/index\\_e.html](http://socialunion.gc.ca/nca/June21-2000/english/index_e.html)]

The Standing Committee on National Defence and Veteran's Affairs (SCONDVA), *Moving Forward: A Strategic Plan for Quality of Life Improvements in the Canadian Forces* (Ottawa: Government of Canada, October 1998) [<http://www.parl.gc.ca/InfoComDoc/36/1/NDVA/Studies/Reports/ndvarp03-e.htm>]

Statistics Canada, "*Women in Canada 2000*," *Canadian Policy Studies*, Sept 14 2000 [<http://www.childcarecanada.org/policy/polstudies/can/statswmn.html>]

*Supporting Families and Children: Government of Canada Initiatives* (Early Childhood Development) [[http://unionsociale.gc.ca/nca/supporting\\_e.html](http://unionsociale.gc.ca/nca/supporting_e.html)]

---

### III. US GOVERNMENT AND US MILITARY PUBLICATIONS

Department of Defense Instruction No 6060.2, *Child Development Programs*, 19 January 1993

Department of Defense Instruction No 6060.3, *School Age Care Program*, 19 December 1996

Kozaryn, Linda, *DoD Child Care Leads Way* (GovExec.com (Daily Briefing), 29 Apr 1997)  
[<http://www.governmentexecutive.com/dailyfed/0497/042997+1.htm>]

Kozaryn, Linda, *It's a New World Sarge!*  
[<http://www.defenselink.mil/specials/childcare/main/html>]

Secretary of Defense (White House Press Release), *Using Lessons Learned from the Military Child Development Programs to Improve the Quality of Child Care in the United States*, 17 April 1997

Memorandum for Assistant Secretary of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Director Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), Director National Security Agency (NSA), *DoD Child Care Fee Ranges for School Year 2000-2001* [<http://www.dticaw.mil/perdiem/bahfaq/html>]

*Military Children and Youth – Frequently Asked Questions* [[http://military-childrenandyouth.calib.com/mm\\_faq.htm](http://military-childrenandyouth.calib.com/mm_faq.htm)]

Military Children and Youth, *National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000*  
[[http://military-childrenandyouth.calib.com/lpg\\_ndaa.htm](http://military-childrenandyouth.calib.com/lpg_ndaa.htm)]

Military Children and Youth, *Overview of Military Child Development System* [[http://military-childrenandyouth.calib.com/mm\\_cdc.htm](http://military-childrenandyouth.calib.com/mm_cdc.htm)]

*Military Community Programs* [<http://dticaw.dtic.mil/prhome/commprog/html>]

Military Family Resource Centre, *Military Families Staying in Step in the 1990's* (Arlington, VA: Military Family Resource Centre, November 1998)

Rand Research Brief, *The Armed Services' Response to the Military Child Care Act*, (RAND, 1998) [<http://www.rand.org/publications/RB/RB7521/>]

United States Accounting Office, Report to Congressional Requesters, *Child Care – How do Military and Civilian Centre Costs Compare?* (Washington: General Accounting Office, 14 Oct 1999)

US Air Force Instruction 34-276, *Family Childcare Programs*, 1 November 1999

*United States Army Posture Statement FY 01* [[http://www.army.mil/aps/aps\\_ch5\\_4.htm](http://www.army.mil/aps/aps_ch5_4.htm)]

### IV. BOOKS, STUDIES AND REPORTS (NON-GOVERNMENTAL)

---

Afterschool Alliance, ***Afterschool Alert: Poll Report***. (A Report of Findings from the 1999 Mott Foundation/JC Penney Nation wide Survey on Afterschool Programs) [Available from the Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto and at links associated with [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org) and <http://netwinder.cfc-efc.ca>]

The Atkinson Letter, ***Universal Early Childhood Development Services: Time For Action*** (Parts I and II), (Toronto: The Atkinson Charitable Foundation, 21 January 2000)

Beach, Jan and Bertrand, Jane, ***More Than the Sum of the Parts: An Early Childhood Development System for Canada*** (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, October 2000)

Campbell, Nancy et al (National Women's Law Centre), ***Be All That We Can Be: Lessons from the Military For Improving Our Nation's Child Care System*** (Washington, DC: National Women's Law Centre, April 2000)

Canadian Child Care Federation, ***Guiding Principles for Quality Child Care in Canada as Developed at the National Forum on Childcare Interaction***, Summer 94 [Excerpt available from The Canadian Child Care Federation at <http://netwinder.cfc-efc.ca>]

Canadian Child Care Federation, ***National Statement on Quality Child Care*** [<http://netwinder.cfc-efc.ca>]

Capizzano, Jeffery et al, ***Child Care Patterns of School-Age Children with Employed Mothers***, (The Urban Institute, September 2000) [<http://newfederalism.urban.org/html/op41/occa41.html>]

Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, ***Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada: Provinces and Territories, 1998*** (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, 1998)

Cleveland, Gordon and Krashinsky, Michael, ***The Benefits and Costs of Good Child Care: The Economic Rationale for Public Investment in Young Children - A Policy Study*** (Toronto: University of Toronto, March 1998)

Doherty, Gillian et al, ***Child Care: Canada Can't Work Without It***, Occasional Paper No. 5 (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, 1995)

Doherty, Gillian et al, ***You Bet I Care (Vol I)! A Canada-Wide Study on: Wages, Working Conditions and Practices in Child Care Centres*** (Guelph, Ont: University of Guelph, 2000)

---

Doherty, Gillian et al *You Bet I Care (Vol III)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Regulated Family Child Care Across Canada* (Guelph, Ont: University of Guelph, 2000)

Friendly, Martha, *A National Child Care Program: Now is the Time*. *Pediatric Child Health*, Vol 5, No 5 July/Aug 2000. [Excerpt avail from: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto and at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]

Goelman, Hillel et al, *You Bet I Care (Vol II)! Caring and Learning Environments: Quality in Child Care Centres Across Canada* (Guelph, Ont: University of Guelph, 2000)

Phillips, Paul and Phillips, Erin, *Women & Work: Inequality in the Canadian Labour Market* (Toronto: James Lorner & Co Ltd, 2000)

Schulman, Karen [Children's Defense Fund 2000], *The High Cost of Child Care Puts Quality Out of Reach for Many Families* (Washington: Children's Defense Fund, 2000) [Copy available from the Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto]

*Statistics Summary: Canadian Early Childhood Care and Education in the 1990s (revised)*, (Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban & Community Studies, University of Toronto, n.d.) [[www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]

#### V. MISCELLANEOUS ARTICLES AND WEB SOURCES

Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Childcare Vouchers. What do We Know About Them?* [Available from: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]

Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *What Does Research Tell Us About Quality in Child Care?* [Available from: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]

Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *Is Child Care a Good Public Investment?* . [Available from: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]

Childcare Resource and Research Unit, University of Toronto, *You Bet I Care Fact Sheet!* [Available from: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org) and the University of Guelph at [www.uoguelph.ca/cfw](http://www.uoguelph.ca/cfw)]

Chudnovsky, Rita, *The View from Canada*. Presented at an international symposium: "Advancing Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada, the US, the UK and Australia" [<http://www.childcarecanada.org>]

---

[Resources/CRRUpubs/plenary/ec4.html](#)]

Doherty, Gillian, *Standards of Practice and Quality Child Care*, [Except Available from: Canadian Child Care Federation at <http://netwinder.cfc-efc.ca> and from the Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto at [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]

Fife, Robert, *Airman Eyed for Defence Post*, *National Post*, 16 March 2001

Friendly, Martha, *What is the Public Interest in Child Care?* *Policy Options*, Jan/Feb 1997. [Available from: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto]

Gillis, Charlie, *Provinces Link Daycare to Health Funds: Ministers Won't Back Children's Agenda unit \$4.2 billion in Transfers Fully Restored*, *National Post*, 10 June 2000

Hebert, Chantal, *Childcare Promises Signal Election Looming: The History of Childcare Programs in Canada is that they have Tended to be Election Offerings that Disappear Once all the Votes are Counted* *Hamilton Spectator*, 9 June 2000

Sissons, Brenda and McDowall Black, Heather, *Types of Child Care (Chapter 2) Chosing With Care*. (Addison Wesley, 1992) [Excerpt available from: Canadian Child Care Federation at <http://netwinder.cfc-efc.ca>]

Whitebook, Marcy, *The View from the United States*. Presented at an international symposium: "Advancing Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada, the US, the UK and Australia" [<http://www.childcarecanada.org/Resources/CRRUpubs/plenary/ec3.html>]

## VI. WEB SITES (KEY SOURCES)

Canadian Childcare Federation [<http://netwinder.cfc-efc.ca>] and related links

Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto [[www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)] and related links

### DND/CF:

Human Resources Policy and Issues [<http://www.dnd.ca/hr>] and related links

Military Family Services [[http://www.dnd.ca/hr/cfpsa/dmfs/engraph/tel\\_e.asp](http://www.dnd.ca/hr/cfpsa/dmfs/engraph/tel_e.asp)] and related links

Military Family National Advisory Board, *The Voice of Military Families* [<http://www.mfnab.dnd.ca>]

---

Government of Canada:

Human Resources Development Canada [<http://www.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca>]

The Social Union [<http://unionsociale.gc.ca>]

Statistics Canada [[www.statscan.ca](http://www.statscan.ca)]

Industry Sites:

IBM Canada: [[www.canibm.com/news/latest\\_news/071200\\_childcare.htm](http://www.canibm.com/news/latest_news/071200_childcare.htm)] and  
[[www-3.ibm.com/employment/us/diverse/market\\_wl.html](http://www-3.ibm.com/employment/us/diverse/market_wl.html)]

Abbott Laboratories: [[http://abott.com/career/work\\_life\\_programs.html](http://abott.com/career/work_life_programs.html)]

Johnson & Johnson: [[http://www.jnj.com/careers/work\\_life.html](http://www.jnj.com/careers/work_life.html)]

Microsoft: [[www.microsoft.com/diversity/worklife.asp](http://www.microsoft.com/diversity/worklife.asp)]

Shell: [[www.shell.com](http://www.shell.com)]

GM: [[www.gm.com/company/careers/benefits\\_edu](http://www.gm.com/company/careers/benefits_edu)]

Canadian Auto Workers (CAW): [<http://www.caw.ca/whatwedo/women/childcare>]

The Urban Institute [<http://newfederalism.urban.org>]

US Armed Forces:

Military Children and Youth [<http://military-childrenandyouth.calib.com>] and related links

Military Child Development Program [<http://dticaw.dtic.mil/milchild>] and related links

**VII. CONTACTS – Special Thanks to the Following Individuals for their Research Assistance:**

Martha Friendly and the staff of the *Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto*, [455 Spadina Ave, Suite 305, Toronto, Ont, M5S 2G8 (416) 971-2139 [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)]

The staff of the *Quality of Life (QOL) Project* (NDHQ), in particular, Cdr B.A. Moseley, Della Lawrence and Capt Claude Beauregard

The staff of the *Director Human Resources Research and Evaluation (DHRRE)* (NDHQ), in particular, LCol Janine Knackstedt and J. Dunn

---

Mr Lloyd Gillam and Mr Rick Lee, of the ***Director Pay Policy Development (DPPD)*** (DG Compensation and Benefits/NDHQ) for information regarding the Post-Living Differential

The staff of the ***Director Military Family Services (DMFS)*** (NDHQ), in particular, Ms Anne-Marie Vaz

Cpl Leeann Eagles of the ***Canadian Forces College*** for her assistance in deriving statistics from DRHIM Reports