

# **Early Childhood Education and Care in Canada 2001**

**MARTHA FRIENDLY • JANE BEACH • MICHELLE TURIANO**

CHILDCARE RESOURCE AND RESEARCH UNIT

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

[WWW.CHILDCARECANADA.ORG](http://WWW.CHILDCARECANADA.ORG)

DECEMBER 2002

Martha Friendly, Jane Beach and Michelle Turiano  
December 2002  
Early childhood education and care in Canada 2001.  
Martha Friendly, Jane Beach and Michelle Turiano  
Childcare Resource and Research Unit  
Centre for Urban and Community Studies  
December 2002, xxiv, 180 pp.  
ISBN 1-896051-24-3

Childcare Resource and Research Unit  
Centre for Urban and Community Studies  
University of Toronto  
455 Spadina Avenue, Ste. 305  
Toronto ON M5S 2G8, Canada  
Tel: 416-978-6895  
Fax: 416-971-2139  
E-mail: [cr ru@chass.utoronto.ca](mailto:cr ru@chass.utoronto.ca)  
Website: [www.childcarecanada.org](http://www.childcarecanada.org)

Cover design: Sonya V. Thursby; Opus House Incorporated  
Interior design/layout: J. Lynn Campbell; Opus House Incorporated

National Library of Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Friendly, Martha  
Early childhood education and care in Canada: 2001/Martha Friendly, Jane Beach, Michelle Turiano. 5th ed.

First eds. published under title: Child care in Canada; 4th ed. published under title: Early childhood care and education in Canada. Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-896051-24-3

1. Early childhood education—Government policy—Canada. 2. Child care services—Government policy—Canada. I. Beach, Jane II. Turiano, Michelle, 1972- III. University of Toronto. Childcare Resource and Research Unit IV. Title. V. Title: Early childhood care and education in Canada.

HQ778.7.C3C44 2003 372.21'0971 C2003-900423-6

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS VI

PREFACE VII

EXPLANATORY NOTES IX

THE STATE OF ECEC IN CANADA: AN OVERVIEW XIII

FEDERAL ECEC PROGRAMS XIX

**TABLE 1** ECEC AND RELATED PROGRAMS UNDER FEDERAL AEGIS

ABORIGINAL ECEC XXI

**TABLE 2** FEDERAL ABORIGINAL ECEC PROGRAMS

## PROVINCES AND TERRITORIES

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR 1

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND 9

NOVA SCOTIA 17

NEW BRUNSWICK 25

QUÉBEC 33

ONTARIO 45

MANITOBA 57

SASKATCHEWAN 67

ALBERTA 77

BRITISH COLUMBIA 85

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES 97

NUNAVUT 105

YUKON TERRITORY 113

## THE BIG PICTURE

**TABLE 3** VARIETIES OF ECEC SERVICES IN ALL JURISDICTIONS, CANADA – 2001 121

**TABLE 4** NUMBER OF CHILDREN 0-12 YEARS BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001 122

**TABLE 5** CHILDREN 0-12 YEARS WITH MOTHERS IN THE PAID LABOUR FORCE BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001 126

**TABLE 6** WORKFORCE PARTICIPATION OF MOTHERS BY AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD – 2001 127

**TABLE 7** FAMILY-RELATED LEAVE BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001 128

**TABLE 8** SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001 130

**TABLE 9** REGULATED CHILD CARE SPACES BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001 132

**TABLE 10** SPONSORSHIP OF REGULATED CENTRE-BASED PROGRAMS BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001 133

**TABLE 11** ON-RESERVE CHILD CARE CENTRES BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001 134

TABLE 12	TOTAL PROVINCIAL ALLOCATION AND ALLOCATION FOR EACH REGULATED CHILD CARE SPACE BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001	135
TABLE 13	TOTAL PROVINCIAL ALLOCATION AND ALLOCATION TO REGULATED CHILD CARE FOR EACH CHILD 0-12 YEARS IN THE PROVINCE – 2001	136
TABLE 14	EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE FUNDS SPENT ON REGULATED CHILD CARE BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001	137
TABLE 15	NATIONAL CHILD BENEFIT REINVESTMENT STRATEGY FUNDS SPENT ON REGULATED CHILD CARE BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2000-2001	138
TABLE 16	NET INCOME ELIGIBILITY LEVELS FOR FULL AND PARTIAL CHILD CARE FEE SUBSIDIES BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001	139
TABLE 17	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF CHILDREN IN REGULATED CHILD CARE RECEIVING SUBSIDIES BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001	140
TABLE 18	MEDIAN MONTHLY PARENT FEES FOR FULL-TIME CENTRE-BASED CHILD CARE – 1998	141
TABLE 19	MINIMUM TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR CENTRE-BASED STAFF BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001	142
TABLE 20	YEARS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD CARE AND EDUCATION TRAINING OF CENTRE-BASED STAFF – 1998	144
TABLE 21	MEAN GROSS HOURLY WAGE FOR CENTRE-BASED CHILD CARE STAFF BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 1998	145
TABLE 22	MAXIMUM STAFF:CHILD RATIOS IN FULL-DAY CENTRE-BASED CHILD CARE BY AGE AND PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001	146
TABLE 23	MAXIMUM GROUP SIZES IN FULL-DAY CENTRE-BASED CHILD CARE BY AGE AND PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001	147
TABLE 24	REQUIREMENTS FOR REGULATED FAMILY CHILD CARE PROVIDERS BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001	148
TABLE 25	PROCESS QUALITY RATINGS: MEAN ECERS-R (1998), ITERS (1998) AND FDCRS (1999) SCORES BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY	149
TABLE 26	MAXIMUM NUMBER OF CHILDREN PERMITTED IN UNREGULATED FAMILY CHILD CARE BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 2001	150

## THE LONG VIEW

TABLE 27	NUMBER OF CHILDREN 0-12 YEARS BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001	153
TABLE 28	NUMBER OF CHILDREN 0-12 YEARS WITH MOTHERS IN THE PAID LABOUR FORCE BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001	154
TABLE 29	REGULATED CHILD CARE SPACES BY PROVINCES/TERRITORY – 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001	155
TABLE 30	PERCENT OF CHILDREN 0-12 YEARS FOR WHOM THERE IS A REGULATED CHILD CARE SPACES BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001	156
TABLE 31	PERCENT OF REGULATED CENTRE-BASED SPACES THAT ARE NOT-FOR-PROFIT BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001	157
TABLE 32	ALLOCATIONS IN ACTUAL AND CONSTANT 2001 DOLLARS FOR REGULATED CHILD CARE BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001	158
TABLE 33A	ALLOCATION IN ACTUAL \$ FOR EACH REGULATED CHILD CARE SPACE BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001	159

TABLE 33B	ALLOCATION IN ACTUAL AND CONSTANT 2001 DOLLARS FOR EACH REGULATED CHILD CARE SPACE, CANADA – 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001	159
TABLE 34A	ALLOCATION IN ACTUAL DOLLARS ON REGULATED CHILD CARE FOR EACH CHILD IN THE PROVINCE AGED 0-12 YEARS BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY	160
TABLE 34B	ALLOCATION IN ACTUAL AND CONSTANT 2001 DOLLARS FOR EACH CHILD IN THE PROVINCE, CANADA – 1992,1995,1998, 2001	160
TABLE 35	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF CHILDREN IN REGULATED CHILD CARE RECEIVING SUBSIDIES BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001	161
TABLE 36	NET INCOME ELIGIBILITY LEVELS FOR FULL CHILD CARE SUBSIDY FOR ONE PARENT, ONE CHILD FAMILY BY PROVINCE/TERRITORY – 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001	162
TABLE 37	MEAN GROSS HOURLY WAGE (IN ACTUAL \$) FOR CENTRE-BASED CHILD CARE STAFF – 1991, 1998	163

**Government ECEC websites 165**

**Further readings 167**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Collecting and organizing the material that makes up each edition of Early Childhood Education and Care in Canada is a huge task. This fifth version, 2002, was a collective effort that relied on the skills, talents, perseverance and dedication of a number of people. Jane Beach coordinated the collection and refinement of data including administrative data from each jurisdiction and was assisted in this by Donna Michal. Jocelyne Tougas collected information and provided language support in Québec. At the Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Michelle Turiano shared in all stages of the effort, organizing and refining the data and checking data and figures. Ryerson Early Childhood Education students Carolyn Ferns and Suchi Garg provided immense help in summarizing data and creating its representation in tables. Jennifer Cho provided research assistance and support. And Richard Shillington provided assistance in assembling demographic data and national statistics.

Federal and provincial/territorial child care and education officials could not have been more generous in contributing their time and expertise as were the child care community members with whom we met across the country — as always, we are most grateful for their efforts. Finally, we would like to express appreciation to Human Resources Development Canada for funds for this project and for its support for the Childcare Resource and Research Unit.

Martha Friendly

## PREFACE

This is the fifth synthesis of Canada-wide child care information that the Childcare Resource and Research Unit has produced since the late 1980s. The first versions were called *Child Care in Canada: Provinces and Territories*. Then – in recognition of the prevailing view that, as Carol Bellamy, the Executive Director of UNICEF observed “*There is a growing consensus that child care and early education are inseparable*” — the last (1998) version’s title was modified to include early childhood education. The content, however, was still mostly (although no longer entirely) about child care. In this version, we have added a new major section that presents a range of information about publicly funded kindergarten in all provinces and territories.

Between the publication of the 1998 version and completion of this 2001 version, while public policy has not yet begun to shift, Canadian understanding of an integrated concept of care and education has begun to mature. A major contribution to our knowledge of child care and early childhood education has been made by an international study, a Thematic Review of Early Childhood Education and Care, conducted by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). This policy study uses the term “early childhood education and care” to

reflect the growing consensus in OECD countries that “care” and “education” are inseparable concepts...the use of the term ECEC supports an integrated and coherent approach to policy and provision, which is inclusive of all children and all parents regardless of employment or socioeconomic status. This approach recognizes that such arrangements may fulfill a wide range of objectives including care, learning and social support (OECD, 2001: 14).

Detailed reviews of ECEC in the 12 participating countries led to the study’s conclusion that eight interrelated aspects of policy and program are the “key elements...that are likely to promote equitable access to quality ECEC” (OECD, 2001:125). The eight “policy lessons” following are a useful tool for readers of this document to keep in mind:

- **Policy lesson 1. A systematic and integrated approach to policy development and implementation.** The Thematic Review emphasized the importance of a clear vision of children as a social group to underpin ECEC policy. A systematic and integrated approach requires a coordinated policy framework and a lead ministry that works in co-operation with other departments and sectors.
- **Policy lesson 2. A strong and equal partnership with the education system** suggests that the nation supports a lifelong learning approach from birth to encourage smooth transitions for children and recognize ECEC as a foundation of the education process.
- **Policy lesson 3. A universal approach to access, with particular attention to children in need of special support** is linked to equitable access so all children can have the equal and fair opportunities provided by high quality ECEC regardless of family income, parental employment status, special educational needs or ethnic/language background.
- **Policy lesson 4. Substantial public investment in services and the infrastructure.** The Thematic Review found that while a combination of sources may fund ECEC, substantial government investment is required to support a sustainable system of quality, accessible services.
- **Policy lesson 5. A participatory approach to quality improvement and assurance** begins with the premise that all forms of ECEC should be regulated and monitored. Defining, ensuring and monitoring quality should be a participatory and democratic process. Pedagogical frameworks focusing on children’s holistic development and strategies for ongoing quality improvement are key parts of this element.
- **Policy lesson 6. Appropriate training and working conditions for staff in all forms of provision** is a foundation for quality ECEC services, which depend on strong staffing and fair working conditions. Strategies for recruiting and retaining a qualified, diverse, mixed-gender workforce and for ensuring that a career in ECEC is satisfying, respected and financially viable are essential.

- **Policy lesson 7. Systematic attention to monitoring and data collection** with coherent procedures for collecting and analyzing data on the status of young children, ECEC provision, and the early childhood workforce are required.
- **Policy lesson 8. A stable framework and long-term agenda for research and evaluation** requires sustained investment to support research on key policy goals and is a necessary part of a process of continuous improvement.

Finally, it is important to note that a recurring theme in the successive Child Care in Canada documents has been concern about the frailty of much of the data that is available. While there continues to be too little reliable, recurrently collected cross-Canada data about regulated child care, kindergarten, or related early childhood services, it is reassuring to note that two of the OECD's policy lessons (7 and 8) are concerned with the value and importance of evaluation, research and data as a tool for making improvements.

Martha Friendly

December 2002

#### **References**

Organization for Economic and Co-operative Development. (2001). Starting strong: Early childhood education and care. Summary report, Thematic Review of Early Child-hood Education and Care. Paris: Author.



## EXPLANATORY NOTES

Every effort was made to ensure the accuracy of the data provided in this publication and to use accurate and consistent terminology and categories across provinces/territories whenever possible. This was not always possible, however, due to the use of different terminologies, categories and data collection methods. In some cases, information which is consistent by date or definition were not available; where this occurs, dates and definitions are provided or noted in the text or in footnotes.

### METHOD

The data were assembled from a variety of sources including Canada-wide data sources (identified below), federal/ provincial/territorial government officials and from community and other resources.

Information on federal ECEC programs was assembled using written and online sources. These were enhanced and clarified through telephone interviews with federal officials.

The method used to collect data on regulated child care from each province/territory followed a series of steps. First, a written questionnaire was sent to each provincial/territorial child care office. P/T officials then assembled their data; this was followed by a visit to each jurisdiction where meetings were held with the range of officials who had relevant information. Additional meetings with community representatives were then held. Using a combination of material provided by government officials, community groups, written and web site material, a draft of the material was then compiled. Each jurisdiction assisted further by providing clarification and updates. Further follow-up was done throughout the editing stage to ensure the information's accuracy.

Kindergarten information was assembled by identifying and contacting the official (or officials) in each jurisdiction with responsibility for kindergarten and, through telephone interviews, collecting information using a short questionnaire developed for this purpose. These data were supplemented by written and website information; sources are noted in the text where they were used. Community representatives were not involved in supplementing this information.

It should be noted that timely information that is consistent across Canada is often not available.

### DATA SOURCES

#### **Number of children 0-12 years.**

Special tabulation based on the Labour Force Survey. Conducted by Statistics Canada.

#### **Children 0-12 years with mothers in the paid labour force.**

Special tabulation based on the Labour Force Survey. Conducted by Statistics Canada.

#### **Children 0-14 years identifying with an Aboriginal group.**

Statistics Canada. 1996 Census of Canada. *Aboriginal data*. Dimensions Series; Catalogue No. 94F0011XCB, Ottawa, ON.

For the 1996 Census, either a long or a short version of a standard questionnaire was distributed to all households across Canada. The long questionnaire included a question about the respondent's ethnic origins and another which asked if the respondent was registered under the Indian Act of Canada. The long questionnaire was distributed to all households on reserves and settlements and to approximately 20% of the remaining households in Canada. It should be noted that data comparable to these from the 2001 census are expected to become available in the spring of 2003.

### **Children 0-14 years with disabilities (2001)**

Statistics Canada. (2002, December). *A profile of disability in Canada, 2001: Participation and activity limitation survey*. Catalogue no. 89-579-XIE

The Participation and Activity Limitation Survey uses the World Health Organization's (WHO) framework of disability provided by the International Classification of Functioning (ICF). This framework defines disability as the relationship between body structures and functions, daily activities and social participation, while recognizing the role of environmental factors.

For the purpose of PALS, persons with disabilities are those who reported difficulties with daily living activities, or who indicated that a physical, mental condition or health problem reduced the kind or amount of activities they could do. The respondents' answers to the disability questions represent their perception of the situation and are therefore subjective.

### **Workforce participation of mothers by age of youngest child**

Statistics Canada. *Labour force historical review*. Statistics Canada #71F0004XCB

These figures include employed and unemployed women by age of child. These two categories are considered to be in the labour force. These figures do not include women who are not in the paid labour force (e.g. students or individuals enrolled in a training program, or other guardians responsible for children).

### **Family-related leave**

Length of maternity, parental and adoption leave in Employment Standards Legislation (unpaid).

Table from Labour Law Analysis, Strategic Policy and International Labour Affairs, Labour Program. Human Resources Development Canada (February 18, 2002). Available online at:

[http://labour.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/psait\\_spila/lmnec\\_eslc/parental\\_leave.htm](http://labour.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/psait_spila/lmnec_eslc/parental_leave.htm).

Work-life balance in Canada: A report to Ministers responsible for labour in Canada, Chapter II. (March 2001, updated February 2002). The legislative framework. Available online at:

<http://labour-travail.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/worklife/wlbc-ctvpc/c2.cfm#1B>.

### **Number of births**

Statistics Canada. *The Daily*. September 26, 2002

### **Maternity leave claims**

*Employment Insurance 2000 assessment and monitoring reports*. Canadian Employment Insurance Commission. Human Resources Development Canada. Table 2.9, 2.10, 2.11.

### **Spending for EI maternity and parental leave benefits (2001)**

EI Benefits, Statistics Canada. CANSIMIL, Table 276-0005

### **Federal ECEC programs**

*Federal/Provincial/Territorial Early Childhood Development Agreement : Report on Government of Canada activities and expenditures*. (2000-2001). Health Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, and Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Available on-line at: [http://socialunion.gc.ca/ecd/intro\\_e.html](http://socialunion.gc.ca/ecd/intro_e.html) and as reported by officials.

### **Average wages in regulated child care 1998**

Doherty, G., Lero, D., Goelman, H., LaGrange, A., & Tougas, J. (2000). *You bet I care! A Canada-wide study on: Wages, working conditions, and practices in child care centres*. Guelph, ON: Centre for Families, Work and Well-being, University of Guelph.

### **Fees in regulated child care 1998**

Doherty, G., Lero, D., Goelman, H., LaGrange, A., & Tougas, J. (2000). *You bet I care! A Canada-wide study on: Wages, working conditions, and practices in child care centres*. Guelph, ON: Centre for Families, Work and Well-being, University of Guelph.

### **Quality: Average scores on the ECERS-R, ITERS and FDCRS in six provinces and one territory**

Goelman, H., Doherty, G., Lero, D., LaGrange, A., & Tougas, J. (2000). *You bet I care!: Caring and learning environments. Quality in child care centres across Canada*. Guelph, ON: Centre for Families, Work and Well-being, University of Guelph.

Doherty, G., Lero, D., Goelman, H., Tougas, J. & LaGrange, A. (2000). *You bet I care! Caring and learning environments: Quality in regulated family child care across Canada*. Guelph, ON: Centre for Families, Work and Well-being, University of Guelph.

### **Provincial allocation for regulated child care in Ontario**

Preliminary options regarding redirection of child care funding. Draft. (2001). Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

### **Aboriginal ECEC programs**

*Federal/Provincial/Territorial Early Childhood Development Agreement : Report on Government of Canada activities and expenditures*. (2000 - 2001). Health Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, and Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Available on-line at [http://socialunion.gc.ca/ecd/intro\\_e.html](http://socialunion.gc.ca/ecd/intro_e.html) and as reported by officials.

### **Varieties of ECEC programs under federal and provincial/territorial jurisdiction**

*Federal/Provincial/Territorial Early Childhood Development Agreement : Report on Government of Canada activities and expenditures*. (2000-2001). Health Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, and Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Available on-line at [http://socialunion.gc.ca/ecd/intro\\_e.html](http://socialunion.gc.ca/ecd/intro_e.html) and as reported by officials.

### **Use of the National Child Benefit for regulated child care by province/territory 2001**

*The National Child Benefit 2001 progress report*. (2001). Available on-line at: [http://www.nationalchildbenefit.ca/home\\_e.html](http://www.nationalchildbenefit.ca/home_e.html).

### **Use of Early Childhood Development Initiative funds for regulated child care by province/territory 2001**

Information as reported by provincial/territorial officials.

## THE STATE OF ECEC IN CANADA: AN OVERVIEW

Each of Canada's 14 jurisdictions — 10 provinces, three territories and the federal government — has its own approach to early childhood education and care. Each has a number of programs for “care”, “education” and for meeting other objectives such as ameliorating the effects of poverty and supporting parents. Overall, Canada does not have a national strategy for early childhood education and care (ECEC).

Each of the provinces and territories has a provincial program of regulated child care that usually encompasses nursery or preschool, centre-based full-day child care, regulated family child care and school-age child care. The provincial child care programs provide legislated requirements for operation of services and a variety of funding arrangements, usually under a social or community services ministry. Provincial/territorial governments also have responsibility for public kindergartens that are usually part-day for five year olds under ministries of education. Generally, kindergarten programs for five year olds (or fours in Ontario and, to a more limited extent, elsewhere) are a public responsibility while “care” and early childhood education for children younger than age five is assumed to be a private, family responsibility. In addition to these provincial/territorial programs, there are a variety of care and education programs — for example, Aboriginal Head Start and the First Nations/Inuit Child Care Initiative — under the aegis of the federal government.

These programs — regulated child care and kindergarten — supplemented by family resource programs that are primarily intended to support parents, an assortment of cash payments to parents to pay for care, and maternity and parental leave, constitute ECEC in Canada.

In 2002, most children with working parents (more than 70% of children aged 3-5 years have mothers in the paid labour force) are cared for in unregulated child care while parents work, train or study. These arrangements are sometimes provided by a relative, by an unregulated family child care provider or in-home caregiver. Organized ECEC services across Canada are in short supply or — like public kindergarten — are not labour force sensitive. Some — like regulated child care — are too costly for ordinary families or not always sufficiently high quality to be “developmental”. Many young school-aged children are alone after school or attend recreation or other community programs that are not intended to provide “care”.

The range and of early childhood education and care services and access to them vary enormously by region and circumstances. However, no region of Canada yet provides a system of well-designed and funded early childhood education and care services to meet the needs of a majority of families and children.

### HISTORY OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE

The history of early childhood education and care in Canada begins in the mid-19th century. Kindergartens were preceded by infant schools that developed in the first half of the 1800s in several provinces to offer care and instruction to poor children. The first private kindergartens — initially motivated by the idea that children benefit from formal education and then influenced by contemporary thinking about the importance of education in early childhood — began to appear and, in cities and larger towns, were commonplace by the end of the 1870s.

The kindergarten movement soon moved beyond its first middle and upper class clientele as private kindergartens spread across Canada. These included “free kindergartens”, run by missionary and charitable groups, that began to be used as a tool for social reform and as a way of assimilating immigrant children (Prochner, 2000). Following right on the heels of the first public kindergarten in the United States, the first Canadian public kindergarten opened in the Toronto Board of Education in 1883. Influenced by the work of European educational specialists like Pestalozzi and Froebel, the Ontario kindergartens were recognized officially in 1885 and were funded by the province two years later (Corbett, 1989). Intended for three-to-five year olds and full day, by 1900 there were kindergartens in towns and villages across Ontario (Mathien, 2000).

Some of the early kindergartens were used, in part, as “care” programs. As Toronto’s public school kindergartens were becoming more widespread, some were opened to look after children while their mothers were employed. Even before this, however, there were some “care” programs in Montreal, Toronto and, by 1920, in Halifax, Ottawa, Winnipeg, Vancouver and other cities; some of these accommodated infants. Throughout this period, these early childhood services were developed and run by charitable, mostly women’s, groups.

While there was organized child care in a number of Canada’s provinces early in the 1900s, there was little government involvement until World War II. A 1942 Order-in-Council established the Dominion-Provincial-War-time Agreement, the first — and still most direct — federal intervention into organized child care. It offered 50 % cost sharing to assist provinces to provide child care for children whose mothers were working in essential war industries. Only Ontario and Québec participated in this agreement. After the war, the federal government withdrew its support and all six of the Québec child care centres, and many of Ontario’s, closed.

Since World War II, the federal government’s role in child care has mostly been indirect and limited. Nevertheless, its second foray into the area in 1966 had an important impact on the way child care has developed since that time. The Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) was introduced in 1966 to ameliorate or prevent poverty. Through the provisions of CAP, the Government of Canada entered into cost sharing agreements with the provinces for welfare services, including child care. For the purpose of 50-50 cost sharing, CAP treated child care like other welfare services and established federal conditions for cost sharing. These conditions stipulated that federal funds were available to pay only for services for needy, or potentially needy, families, and that to be eligible for funding as a welfare service, child care had to be regulated and public or not-for-profit. The design of CAP meant that federal funds were used almost exclusively for fee subsidies for families who were income- or means-tested to determine eligibility.

As social services are a provincial responsibility in Canada, the provinces were not compelled to participate. However, although it took a decade for them all to begin to use CAP’s child care provisions eventually, all the provinces cost shared their eligible child care costs through CAP. CAP thus began to spur the development of child care services throughout Canada and to shape their evolution throughout the 1970s and 1980s. The residual approach to funding meant that regulated child care emerged as a welfare rather than a universal or educational service.

But as mothers with young children entered the paid labour force in growing numbers, middle class families also began to use child care centres that usually served both subsidized and fee paying families. Although there were always difficulties with the limited funding arrangements, the supply of regulated child care services grew dramatically throughout Canada as most of the provinces developed and refined service delivery, regulation and funding in the 1970s and 1980s. In 1971, parental out-of-pocket child care expenses were allowed as a tax deduction under The Income Tax Act and maternity benefits for eligible new mothers were included under The Unemployment Insurance Act. The provinces — beginning with Québec in 1979 — began to provide funds to child care centres to offset their operating costs or to improve wages. Community demand for a national child care program — supported by the growing feminist movement — swelled throughout the 1980s.

At the same time — separated conceptually, administratively and programmatically from “care”, public kindergarten was established in almost every province and territory, becoming an entitlement in most jurisdictions. By the mid-1980s, most Canadian five year olds (and in Ontario, four year olds) were enrolled in public, mostly half-day, kindergarten programs.

## EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE IN THE 1990s

Between 1984 and 1995, there were three significant attempts to develop a national approach to child care as successive federal governments announced that a national strategy for child care would be developed. Each of these — the Task Force on Child Care set up by the Trudeau government (1984), the Special Committee on Child Care of the Mulroney government (1986), and the initiative based on Jean Chrétien’s 1993 Red Book election commitment — was started by a federal government. Each recognized that social/educational services such as child care are areas of provincial jurisdiction. However, none of these

efforts was successful in producing a pan-Canadian strategy or approach to early childhood education and care.

In the mid-1990s, Canada's political arrangements (which had historically featured tensions between federal and provincial roles) tilted toward provincial domination. This shift very much impacted on the future of early childhood education and care. During this period, the Canada Assistance Plan was abolished (1996) and all federal dollars for provincial health, education and welfare programs were subsumed into a block fund, the Canada Health and Social Transfer (CHST). Social policy experts feared that, without conditions like those that had been part of the CAP agreement, provincial spending of the substantially reduced federal dollars in the CHST would become less accountable to either the federal government or the public.

A debate about what was termed "social policy renewal" arose in a climate of anxiety about Québec separation and the fiscal deficit. This was formalized in February 1999 as the federal government and the nine provinces comprising "the rest of Canada" outside Québec signed the Social Union Framework Agreement<sup>1</sup> (SUFA) (see below).

## ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ECEC

### **Federal role**

That Canada is governed by a federal system is key in how responsibilities for ECEC are defined. The division of powers between federal and provincial governments was originally defined in the Constitution Act of 1867 and has evolved over the years. While (as the previous section describes) the federal government had at one time shared the cost of fee subsidies with the provinces, and successive federal governments in the 1980s and 1990s contemplated a national child care strategy, in 2002 the federal government's role in ECEC consists of several intergovernmental funding schemes that are not specific to ECEC (the Early Childhood Development Initiative, the National Child Benefit Reinvestment Strategy and the Canada Health and Social Transfer) and a number of ECEC programs that are targeted to particular populations and circumstances. These are described in Table 1 and Table 2.

There is no federal role in public education, including kindergarten. The federal government does not pay for education nor is there a national department of education.

### **Intergovernmental arrangements: SUFA, the National Children's Agenda and the Early Childhood Development Initiative**

The Social Union Framework Agreement or A Framework to Improve the Social Union for Canadians (1999) is the most important current intergovernmental (federal/ provincial) arrangement for ECEC. SUFA sets out how federal or joint social programs will be constructed or modified. Beginning with a series of principles including that of "ensuring access for all Canadians wherever they live or move in Canada, to essential social programs and services of reasonably comparable quality", SUFA commits both levels of government to working in collaboration and to enhancing transparency and accountability. The federal government agrees not to introduce new social programs in areas of provincial jurisdiction without agreement of a majority of provinces and retains its spending powers. SUFA committed the governments to a full public review of the Agreement and its implementation "by the end of the third year", or February 4, 2002.

The National Children's Agenda (NCA) has been SUFA's primary activity. Consisting of a broad "vision" statement, the NCA was, in turn, signed by the nine provinces and the federal government in May 1999. A third federal/provincial agreement, also nested under SUFA, the Early Childhood Development Agreement (ECDI), emerged in September 2000 at the annual First Ministers' meeting<sup>2</sup>. This initiative transferred federal dollars to the provinces for "early learning and care" as one of four program areas from which provinces may choose (See Table 14 for provincial/territorial spending under the ECDI).

In the October 2002 Throne Speech, the federal government made a commitment to "work with its partners to increase access to early learning opportunities and to quality child care, particularly for poor and lone-parent families".

## **Provincial/territorial jurisdiction**

With few exceptions, Canadian ECEC services — child care, nursery schools, kindergarten — like health, social services, and elementary, secondary and post-secondary education, are under the jurisdiction of provinces and territories. Each of Canada's 10 provinces and three territories has developed a program of regulated child care and a program for public kindergartens. (These are summarized in more detail in the Service Overview section below).

## **Local governments, the community, parent-users and advocates**

Canadian municipalities do not have powers assigned by constitutional arrangements but are rather subordinate to the provinces who delegate powers — including taxing powers — to them. Outside Ontario — where they play several important roles in child care (funding, operation of services (about 10% of regulated child care services) and some policy-setting) — municipal/regional governments generally do not have a role in regulated child care although Vancouver plays a key role as well.

Local school boards (or school divisions) — also subordinate to provincial governments — usually have primary responsibility for the operation of elementary schools including kindergarten.

“The community” and parent-users are also an important part of Canadian ECEC. At the service delivery level, the bulk of the supply of regulated child care is initiated and maintained by parent and/or voluntary boards of directors; these child care programs comprise most of the not-for-profit child care sector that represents more than 80% of the total supply. Otherwise parents generally have little specific role in regulated child care, although the bulk of child care services are paid for by parent fees (a 1998 national study found that an average of 49.2% of revenue for full-day child care centres came from parent fees (Doherty, Lero, Goelman, LaGrange and Tougas, 2000).

In most parts of Canada, advocacy, professional and service groups and, to some extent, organized parent groups where they exist, make up what is often called “the child care community”. These groups are important providers of services like professional development and in-service training.

Advocacy for more and better child care — and now ECEC — has been a visible feature of the Canadian ECEC landscape for decades. Alliances with other groups with an interest in ECEC — for example, the labour movement, anti-poverty activists and feminists — have long been a fundamental element of Canadian advocacy for child care.

## **SERVICE OVERVIEW**

Most of Canada's ECEC programs are under provincial jurisdiction. Generally, regulated child care includes centres, usually nursery schools (except in Québec, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and the Yukon) or preschools (part-day centre-based programs) and regulated family child care under the same legislation. Overall, spaces in regulated child care services are available for almost 600,000 of Canada's almost 5,000,000 children aged 0-12, with substantial regional and age-related variations in availability.

Almost all jurisdictions now require at least some of the staff working in child care with children to have some training in early childhood education; however, Canadian requirements for early childhood training are generally acknowledged to be less than adequate (see Table 19 for a summary of ECE training requirements in regulated child care). Concerns about the quality of Canadian child care services were reinforced in the late 1990s with the publication of *You Bet I Care!*, a Canada-wide study of staffing and quality in child care centres (Goelman, Doherty, Lero, LaGrange and Tougas, 2000) and regulated family child care (Doherty, Lero, Goelman, Tougas, and LaGrange, 2000).

All jurisdictions subsidize some or all costs in regulated child care for low-income parents. However, in most cases, limitations on the number of these subsidies exclude many eligible parents; in other cases, the subsidy provided does not cover the whole fee. Some provinces also provide funds to support the overall operation of child care services; this may be in the form of wage grants to raise staff wages. Overall, though, except in Québec, child care is primarily a fee-paying service in Canada, with many families not able to access services due to costs. Only Québec has set out a goal of universal child care, designated substantial public funding and designed a multiyear plan to move towards it.

All of the provinces and territories also provide public kindergarten. In almost all cases (except Prince Edward Island) kindergarten is part of the public education system and in most jurisdictions it is an entitlement. All provinces/territories provide kindergarten for five year olds; in Ontario, most school boards offer universal four year old kindergarten too. Most kindergarten is part-day or part-time (in Québec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, full-day kindergarten is the norm). Attendance at kindergarten is compulsory in a number of jurisdictions (New Brunswick, BC, Nova Scotia and the territories); however, almost all eligible children in all jurisdictions attend public kindergarten when this is offered. Three provinces and the territories maintain more than one publicly funded school system (public and Catholic). All offer kindergarten in both official languages where population warrants. Nunavut, the newest jurisdiction, provides kindergarten in Inuktitut.

Generally, there is little connection between kindergarten programs and regulated child care services at either the policy or service delivery level. In some provinces, Ontario, for example, there are many child care centres located in schools. Except in Québec, where school-aged child care is under the aegis of the Ministère de l'Éducation, child care services are usually not the responsibility of the education system but are operated by community boards of directors, other institutions or organizations (such as the YMCA) or by for-profit operators. School-based child care often serves school-aged children but other age groups including infants and toddlers may be served in school locations also.

Provincial/territorial ECEC programs are covered in more detail in the individual section for each jurisdiction, and in the Big Picture and Long View tables. ECEC services for Aboriginal communities and those under federal aegis are described in the sections that follow.

#### Notes

- 1 Québec is not a signatory to the Social Union Framework Agreement
- 2 While sharing the same concerns on early childhood development, Québec does not adhere to these federal-provincial-territorial documents.

#### References

- Corbett, B. (1989). *A century of kindergarten education in Ontario: 1887-1987*. Mississauga, ON: The Froebel Foundation.
- Doherty, G., Lero, D., Goelman, H., LaGrange, A., & Tougas, J. (2000). *You bet I care! A Canada-wide study on: Wages, working conditions, and practices in child care centres*. Guelph, ON: Centre for Families, Work and Well-being, University of Guelph.
- Doherty, G., Lero, D., Goelman, H., Tougas, J. & LaGrange, A. (2000). *You bet I care! Caring and learning environments: Quality in regulated family child care across Canada*. Guelph, ON: Centre for Families, Work and Well-being, University of Guelph.
- Goelman, H., Doherty, G., Lero, D., LaGrange, A., & Tougas, J. (2000). *You bet I care! Caring and learning environments. Quality in child care centres across Canada*. Guelph, ON: Centre for Families, Work and Well-being, University of Guelph.
- Mathien, J. (2001). *Children, families, and institutions in late 19th and early 20th century Ontario*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Prochner, L. (2000). *A history of early education and child care in Canada, 1820-1966*. In Prochner, L. & Howe, N. (Eds.). *Early childhood care and education in Canada: 11-65*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.



## FEDERAL ECEC PROGRAMS

Under Canadian constitutional arrangements, it is assumed that child care and early childhood education services (ECEC) fall under provincial/territorial jurisdiction and this is generally the practice. However, there are a number of ECEC services and programs for which the federal government takes responsibility. Although there are some exceptions, ECEC services under federal aegis are intended for populations for whom the federal government has particular responsibility – for example, Aboriginal people, military families, and new immigrants and refugees. Table 1 describes ECEC programs for which the federal government is responsible.

TABLE 1

### Ecec And Related Programs Under Federal Aegis

Program	Department	Objective	Eligibility	Spending
Child-minding	Citizenship and Immigration Canada	Care while parents who are newcomers take language training; intended to "help children adapt to Canada, acquire language, socialization".	Serves primarily 6 months – 6 years. Service provider organizations that provide language instruction for Newcomers programs. Note that national requirements for these are in the development process. In 2001, there were approximately 220 programs across Canada.	n/a
Military Family Resource Centres	Department of National Defence	Promote health and well being, information and referral for parents, aid to families in distress. Mandated programs serve 0-6 years. (May include child care centres).	Member of a military family. Military family resource programs are incorporated as not-for-profit agencies governed by Boards of Directors. In 2001, there were 35 MFRCs in Canada, 3 in the US (and 7 in Europe).	\$4 M (Spending for 0-6 years) (2000-2001) (Additional funds were made available to support new initiatives in 2001–2002)
Child Care Expense Deduction	Canada Customs and Revenue Agency	Reduces income tax associated with child care costs (0-16 years).	Individual tax deduction. Parent with lower income may deduct \$7,000 for children under 7 and \$4,000 for children aged 7-16. Receipt may be requested by CCRA. Claimed by 1.2 million families.	\$424,000,000 (2000-2001)
Maternity/ Parental Leave Benefit	Human Resources Development Canada	Replace partial cost of provincially-determined maternity/parental leave for newborns and newly adopted children.	Female and male parents eligible under Employment Insurance rules.	\$1,763,776,110 (2001)

Community Action Program for Children	Health Canada (Note that CAPC provides a variety of programs which, in some regions, are family resource programs.)	Funds to deliver services to meet the developmental needs of children under age 6 living in conditions of risk. emotional/behavioural	Community coalitions providing specified programs for children: in low-income families; in teenage-parent families; at risk of, or having, developmental delays, social, problems; and /or neglected or abused.  Special consideration is given to Métis, Inuit and off-reserve First Nations children, children of recent immigrants or refugees, children in lone-parent families and children in remote or isolated communities. There are 464 CAPC projects across Canada.	\$59,500,000 (2000-2001)
---------------------------------------	---	---	--	--------------------------

Note: Federal ECEC programs for Aboriginal children are described in Table 2, Aboriginal ECEC programs.

### Maternity and parental leave benefits

While the length of maternity and parental leaves and the conditions determining terms and eligibility are provincially determined under labour legislation, the benefit that pays eligible parents for portions of these leaves falls under the federal Employment Insurance legislation. First included in the then-Unemployment Insurance Act in 1971, the length of the federal benefit has increased a number of times in the intervening years. A notable increase occurred in 1989 when benefits for parental leave (either parent) were added to maternity leave benefits reserved for birth mothers.

Most recently, the federal government increased the parental leave portion of the benefit to 35 weeks. Under these new rules, maternity benefits of 15 weeks and the new parental benefit of 35 weeks to a total of 50 weeks will be paid at 55% of insured earnings up to a maximum of \$413 a week to eligible parents.

The eligibility requirement now is 600 hours of insured work within the past 52 weeks (this requirement was reduced from 700 hours).

In 2001, spending for the federal benefit was:

Maternity	\$831,938,660
Adoption	14,773,150
Parental	917,064,300

Total \$1,763,776,110 The number of initial maternity leave benefit claims (2000/2001) may be found in each provincial/territorial section together with the number of births for 2000, the latest year available. It should be noted that the most recent data available for maternity and parental leave benefit claims (2001/2002) (not used in this publication) indicate a considerable increase in take-up.

# ABORIGINAL ECEC

## CONTEXT

Canada's Aboriginal populations include First Nations and non-status native people (on- and off-reserve), Métis and Inuit. Although many Aboriginal people live in remote and/or northern areas, there are large southern, urban populations as well.

---

Number of children 0-12 years identifying with an Aboriginal group, Canada (1996)

Age	North American Indian	Métis	Inuit
0-4	106,37025,800	7,325	
5-9	101,41524,220	7,025	
10-14	91,88022,605	5,560	

---

Note: These 1996 data are the most recent currently available. New data from the 2001 census are expected to become available in the spring of 2003.

## ISSUES

### Flexibility/accessibility

All Aboriginal groups have larger than average child populations, making early childhood education and care an especially important issue. There is a particular need for a wide range of flexible services to accommodate the diverse needs of the Aboriginal community.

### Cultural integrity

The maintenance of indigenous culture is a major concern for all Aboriginal peoples. Aboriginal organizations point out that general standards for child care centres are sometimes too rigid for northern and/or remote communities and that they may not reflect traditional cultural norms and practices. Culturally sensitive early childhood education as it pertains to training and service delivery is of special concern. There is a strong interest among Aboriginal groups in developing ECEC programs that are operated and controlled by the communities themselves.

### Government policy

Generally, funding for on-reserve social programs is the responsibility of the Government of Canada. In 1996 the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples recommended that

federal, provincial, and territorial governments co-operate to support an integrated early childhood funding strategy that a) extends early childhood education to all Aboriginal children regardless of residence; b) encourages programs that foster the physical, social, intellectual and spiritual development of children, reducing distinctions between child care, prevention and education; c) maximizes Aboriginal control over service design and administration; d) offers one-stop accessible funding; and e) promotes parental involvement and choice in early childhood education options.

Although provincial governments in some provinces carry out regulation of on-reserve Aboriginal child care, other provincial governments have not regulated it. In some provinces, First Nations communities do not recognize provincial jurisdiction on reserves. First Nations and Inuit organizations have responsibility for administration of funds and for developing services.

In the past, funding for child care was limited to First Nations in the Yukon and Northwest Territories, in Ontario and Alberta where the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) covered

costs in accordance with provincial funding policies, and in Québec where child care programs for First Nations children received national funding through the James Bay Northern Québec Agreement. Until 1995, when the First Nations Inuit Child Care Initiative and Aboriginal Head Start were announced, there was relatively little spending for Aboriginal ECEC in much of Canada.

**TABLE 2**

**Federal Aboriginal ECEC programs**

Program	Department	Objective(s)	Eligibility	Spending (2001)
First Nations/ Inuit Child Care Initiative (FNICCI)	Human Resources Development Canada	Intended to achieve levels of quality and quantity of child care in First Nations and Inuit communities that are comparable to those available to the general population (ages 0-12 years).	On-reserve First Nations and Inuit communities. FNICCI funds child care in 389 First Nation and Inuit communities. FNICCI directly supports 6,833 child care spaces. In collaboration with First Nations Head Start and Aboriginal Head Start, FNICCI funds 14,237 spaces.	\$41 M
Child Day Care Program Alberta	Indian and Northern Affairs	Child care for parents' employment/training (ages 0-12 years)	On-reserve First Nations in Alberta (as a result of the 1992 Administrative Reform Agreement (Canada and Alberta).	\$2.7 M
Child Day Care Program Ontario	Indian and Northern Affairs	Child care for parents' employment/training (ages 0-12 years)	On-reserve First Nations in Ontario (as a result of a 1965 agreement between Canada and Ontario).	\$12 M (2000-2001)
Aboriginal Head Start	Health Canada	Child's intellectual, spiritual, emotional and physical growth (ages 2-6 years).	Urban and northern First Nations off-reserve, Métis and Inuit communities. In 2000, there were AHS sites in 8 provinces and 3 territories, 3126 children.	\$22.5 M
First Nations Head Start	Health Canada	Prepares children for schooling by meeting intellectual, spiritual, emotional and physical needs (ages 0-6 years).	On-reserve First Nations communities. As of December 2000, there were 168 funded First Nations Head Start projects (305 communities, 7,000 children).	\$22.9 M
Aboriginal Head Start New Brunswick	Indian and Northern Affairs	Child's social development (ages 0-6 years).	Eleven agencies in New Brunswick.	\$1.8 M (2000-2001)
First Nations Elementary Education (including pre-K and kindergarten)	Indian and Northern Affairs	To provide access to elementary First Nations students on-reserve including pre-K and kindergarten		\$65 M

---

Note: See provincial/territorial Aboriginal ECEC programs, Table 11.

## **RECENT DEVELOPMENTS**

In November 2002, the federal government announced a funding allocation of \$320 million over the next five years “to improve and expand” Early Child Development (ECD) programs and services for First Nations and other Aboriginal children. The funds will expand both Aboriginal Head Start programs, and the First Nations and Inuit Child Care Program; work toward development of a “single window” approach to ensure better integration and coordination; and introduce new research initiatives. These funds were announced in the 2001 federal budget.