
CIVIC AFFAIRS

**Work-Related Day Care — Helping
to Close the Gap**



Bureau of Municipal Research
Better Government Through Research

Council

David Freeman
President
Eric Hardy
Past President
Lorne Almack
Treasurer
Dr. Murray Frum
Vice President
Leon Kentridge
Vice President
Russell J. Morrison
Vice President
D.J. VanAelst
Vice President
D. Geoffrey Armstrong
Maryon Brechin
Alan P. Cole
A.H. DeMille

Robert F. Fellner
W.R. Foster
James L. Franceschini
Jack W. Fraser
Matti Gering
Neal Irwin
Geoffrey Milburn
James A. Mizzoni
William B. Moore
W. Kent Newcomb
G.L. Purcell
William Reno
Lou Sage
Dr. Cope Schwenger
Lorne C. Stephenson
W.L.S. Trivett, Q.C.
Michael B. Vaughan
Mrs. A.H. Wait
Professor John C. Weaver
F.E. Whitehead

Advisory Board

Douglas C. Matthews
Chairman
Jay P. Moreton
Past Chairman
R. Barford
Dr. J. Stefan Dupre
G.M. Gore
G.C. Gray

F.W. Hurst
Arthur J. Langley
J.J. Leroux
Donald McKillop
D.G. Neelands
Peter Oliphant
J.B. Purdy
J. Bryan Vaughan
G.T.N. Woodrooffe

Work-Related Day Care — Helping to Close the Gap

Staff

Executive Director Mary Lynch
Research Associate Ute Wright
Research Associate *Patricia McCarney
Research Associate *Linda Mulhall
Office Manager Judy Milne
Librarian *Mrs. Alice Bull

*Part time

CIVIC AFFAIRS IN BRIEF

Women are entering the work force in greater and greater numbers resulting in an increase in the demand for day care spaces. This demand has been traditionally addressed by public day care facilities which are now unable to keep pace with demand. Private and commercial operations have been increasing in number in the last few years but even these do not meet all of the needs - particularly of middle income people who do not qualify for subsidies and who cannot afford to pay market rates.

The resulting situation means that demands are increasing and the supply of day care spaces is falling further and further behind. The solution is complex but one alternative which needs to be investigated more thoroughly is the possibility of providing day care in the workplace.

This CIVIC AFFAIRS looks at the question of workplace day care as a viable alternative to meet demand. Workplace and work-related day care refer to provision of day care either at or near the place of employment of the parent and also involve the employer in its provision. The report reviews various models of employer participation which have been used particularly in the United States. These models show why employers and employees have become involved and what benefits they have obtained. The study also reviews advantages and disadvantages of workplace day care.

The views of the employees, labour unions and corporate community in Ontario are examined and analyzed. A case study of an employer subsidized day care centre shows how need was assessed, how planning proceeded and what the costs and subsidies were.

The conclusions reached lead to a series of recommendations for action by the Province, municipalities, the business community, employees and labour unions.

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Main entry under title:
Work related day care

(Civic affairs, ISSN 0045-7027 ; Sept. 1981)
ISBN 0-919066-24-0

1. Day care centers - Ontario. 2. Day care centers and industry - Ontario. 3. Day care centers and industry - United States. I. Bureau of Municipal Research (Toronto, Ont.). II. Series.

HV861.C22057

362.7'12

C81-094936-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	DEVELOPMENTS IN CANADA	3
	The Situation in Ontario	5
III	WORKPLACE DAY CARE -- ANOTHER OPTION	13
	Diversity of Service Delivery and Rationale For Workplace Day Care	14
	Five Developmental Models	16
	Costs	21
IV	THE GROWING INTEREST IN CANADA	23
	The Education Sector	24
	The Employees and Labour Unions	25
	The Employers	29
	Hester How Day Care Centre - An Employer Subsidized Model	34
	Summary	38
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	40
	APPENDIX A - Sample Questionnaire	46
	APPENDIX B - Sample Budget	49

I INTRODUCTION

Day care has been the topic of numerous studies at the national, provincial and local levels in the last decade. A number of them have recommended that employers and trade unions become involved in providing workplace day care and that workplace day care ought to be promoted as an integral part of day care provision. Day care studies repeatedly document two points: crucial shortages exist in Ontario; and subsidized day care is available only to a limited number of lower income and single parents, creating an affordability gap for middle income groups. These two factors together with the recommendations of previous studies advocating the involvement of business in day care give rise to the present investigation of workplace and work-related day care. Workplace day care refers to day care physically located at a place of work, whereas work-related day care indicates several possibilities. It may refer to any type of day care or financial contributions toward day care involving the employer, or it may mean day care located in the proximity of employment, or the necessity of providing day care due to parental employment. On the other hand, reference to workplace day care does not exclude the possibility of an employer's involvement in work-related day care as an alternative to workplace day care.

This study reviews day care developments in Canada, concentrating on legislation and provincial policy in Ontario. The review furnishes not only background information but identifies the role that workplace day care can play in the present situation of unmet needs.

We examine workplace and work-related day care as an option in a diverse system of day care delivery and state its benefits and drawbacks. We show how business and industry have become involved in day care in the United States, serving as models for companies north of the border. Canadian examples of business involvement, together with results of a questionnaire and interviews of a number of Toronto based companies show attitudes, determine interest and the extent of current activities and commitment to the idea. The views of the employers and employees are considered, as are those of the education sector and the labour movement. Finally, a working model of workplace day care shows how day care can come about, points to the necessary

elements for success, and demonstrates that workplace day care can be made an affordable alternative. The study culminates in a number of recommendations which clarify the roles for employers, employees, the labour unions, and the day care delivery system.

II DEVELOPMENTS IN CANADA

The development of day care in Canada arose out of wartime necessity. The federal War Time Day Nursery Act came into effect in 1942 and divided capital and operating costs evenly between the federal and provincial governments. This was considered an extreme measure under unusual circumstances which ended in 1946. Because of public protest, Ontario followed immediately with the Ontario Day Nurseries Act. Some provinces remained without day care legislation until the late 1970's, others have regulations dispersed among several provincial acts. The Canada Assistance Plan, enacted in 1966, provides for equal federal/provincial cost sharing of a wide range of welfare services including day care. Initiation of day care programs, however, is the responsibility of the individual provinces and municipalities.

In 1972, a national study on day care conducted by the Canadian Council on Social Development considered the effect of federal legislation (the Canada Assistance Plan) difficult to assess, since few provinces were significantly involved in funding day care, thus not taking full advantage of its provisions. In fact, developments have proceeded extremely haphazardly. The National Study observed:

unevenness in the development of day care services in the different regions of the country and in communities of different sizes and no apparent correlation between the degree of urbanization, the participation rate of women in the labour force and the supply of day care programs.¹

Who is providing day care facilities in Canada? The National Study found that three out of four day care centres and more than 50% of nursery schools were privately operated. There is a tendency to view day care as a parental responsibility which is accentuated by recent developments. The Canadian Council on Social Development observed:

Governments appear to have shifted their support from centres with unionized and uniformly trained staff to family day care with non-unionized providers (i.e. other mothers in the neighbourhood).²

¹Canadian Council on Social Development, Day Care -- Report of A National Study, January 1972, Summary, p. xx.

²Canadian Council on Social Development, Communique, Ottawa, November 13, 1980.

Total group day care spaces in licensed day care facilities increased by 15.9% between 1978 and 1979. Growth in the licensed, subsidized sector in which 95% of all children receive government subsidies, increased by only 4.8%. A further breakdown shows that growth occurred mainly in family day care spaces (licensed care provided in the home of an individual) - an increase of 25.8% for full day care. Community board sponsored spaces (where parents and/or community groups form the sponsoring body) increased by 16.8%. Municipally operated day care in Ontario and Alberta experienced a decrease of 38.7% in available spaces. Parent co-operatives as sponsoring groups also declined, probably due to the inability of single parents to serve on management boards. By contrast, commercial day care (for profit and offering mainly non-subsidized spaces), increased by 28.3% over the previous year's spaces.¹

The increase in commercial spaces has caused concern to some individuals. For example, an American commercial chain which operates 700 centres in the United States, Manitoba and Ontario plans to open another 40 centres in Calgary and Edmonton and 10 in Ottawa. The quality of service has been questioned in the existing commercial centres and politicians have joined day care groups in opposing a move to open 10 centres in Ottawa. In Toronto, 12 day care centres are in operation.²

In summary, day care in Canada is organized and distributed unevenly because of diverse sponsorship, and public day care is looked upon as a welfare provision. Although the need for day care is now widely acknowledged, public financing is lagging behind private and commercial activity in the field. Public financial support appears to be shifting to private family day care. The National Day Care Study in 1972 predicted that "primary responsibility for initiating (public day care) action will probably reside at the local level", warning, however, that "sound planning demands a wider and deeper understanding of this process".³

¹Ministry of National Health and Welfare, Status of Day Care In Canada 1979 -- A Review of the Major Findings of the National Day Care Study, National Day Care Information Centre, Ottawa, pp. 8-11.

²Globe and Mail, "Opposition to U.S. day care", June 4, 1981.

³Canadian Council on Social Development, op. cit., Summary, p. xx.

The Situation in Ontario

From a legislative viewpoint, The Ontario Day Nurseries Act has been described as "a model for emulation by other provinces in their arrangements for day care". From a qualitative and quantitative perspective, it is a model which has left much to be desired according to the Canadian Council on Social Development.

The Ontario Act has not resulted in comprehensive day care services of a high standard. Despite assumption of 80% of the costs of day care services for persons in need, existing services and especially municipally operated centres, fall far short of the overall need.¹

The Ontario Day Nurseries Act is today administered through four regional offices by the Ministry of Community and Social Services. The Province and municipalities share capital costs of building renovations for proposed municipal day care centres at 80% and 20% respectively. New construction costs are split at 50%. The Ministry and the Federal government share in paying 80% of net operating costs of day care spaces which are sponsored by municipalities, Indian bands, or by approved nonprofit organizations. Subsidies apply to children of parents in need. 50% of the subsidy cost is refunded to the Province by the Federal government; 30% is therefore paid by the Province, and 20% by the provider or users. Quotas for subsidized spaces are set by municipal governments and are governed by total allotments determined by the Province. Purchase of service agreements may be entered into by Indian bands and municipalities with private commercial or nonprofit operators. Or, the Province may also enter into direct purchase of service agreements without municipal organizations. These agreements provide for centre or supervised private home day care. Here also, 80% of net cost may be subsidized for those in need. In all cases, subsidies for handicapped children are higher and may attain 100% of operating cost. The attached table gives a breakdown of provincial and municipal expenditures for day nurseries and shows total subsidies. Notwithstanding the wide age span of child population, the large divergence in per child expenditure of total subsidies throughout the province indicates how unevenly distributed subsidized spaces are.

¹Ibid., p. 24.

Provincial and Municipal Expenditures for Day Nurseries
1979-80 Fiscal Year

6.

County, Region or Municipality	Provincial Expenditures \$	Municipal Share (1) \$	Total \$	1979 Child Pop. (0-18)	Per Child Expenditure \$
1. Algoma	316,894	54,907	371,801	44,277	8.40
2. Brant	519,745	84,510	604,255	31,925	18.93
3. Bruce	98,114	11,447	109,561	19,703	5.56
4. Cochrane	442,677	64,717	507,394	35,313	14.37
5. Dufferin	115,188	11,285	126,473	11,472	11.02
6. Durham	1,297,462	202,819	1,500,281	89,456	16.77
7. Elgin	171,897	5,477	177,374	22,507	7.88
8. Essex	1,626,130	284,921	1,911,051	101,927	18.75
9. Frontenac	437,263	74,518	511,781	32,443	15.77
10. Grey	203,049	45,009	248,058	22,865	10.85
11. Haldimand-Norfolk	42,005	3,255	45,260	28,785	1.57
12. Haliburton				3,217	
13. Halton	726,021	100,001	826,022	82,382	10.03
14. Hamilton-Wentworth	2,410,037	461,249	2,871,286	121,487	23.63
15. Hastings	265,391	23,923	289,314	34,328	8.43
16. Huron	185,002	25,749	210,751	18,296	11.52
17. Kenora	524,834	55,003	579,837	21,814	26.58
18. Kent	474,317	32,507	506,824	35,317	14.35
19. Lambton	727,193	86,713	813,906	40,145	20.27
20. Lanark	91,045	22,761	113,806	12,742	8.93
21. Leeds & Grenville	8,809	2,202	11,011	24,479	.45
22. Lennox & Addington				10,834	
23. Manitoulin *					

24. Middlesex	1,388,339	175,284	1,563,632	93,320	16.76
25. Muskoka	29,881	400	30,281	11,201	2.70
26. Niagara	1,247,039	157,493	1,404,532	114,464	12.27
27. Nipissing	158,534	9,291	167,825	29,714	5.65
28. Northumberland				20,422	
29. Ottawa-Carleton	5,856,068	1,299,831	7,155,899	156,518	45.72
30. Oxford	244,033	42,991	287,024	28,112	10.21
31. Parry Sound	42,071	10,518	52,589	10,076	5.22
32. Peel	1,455,121	289,028	1,744,149	149,093	11.70
33. Perth	264,749	66,187	330,936	20,876	15.85
34. Peterborough	430,502	34,597	465,099	30,706	15.15
35. Prescott & Russell	165,620	41,405	207,025	17,613	11.75
36. Prince Edward	38,439		38,439	6,707	5.73
37. Rainy River	69,464	14,635	84,099	8,497	9.90
38. Renfrew	137,814	18,753	156,567	28,978	5.40
39. Simcoe	542,149	28,458	570,607	71,756	7.95
40. Stomont, Dundas and Glengarry	300,719	61,747	362,466	31,355	11.56
41. Sudbury (Dist.)	444,292	42,613	486,905	76,434	6.37
42. Sudbury (Reg.)					
43. Thunder Bay	874,452	142,478	1,016,930	49,599	20.50
44. Timiskaming	32,302	8,076	40,378	14,459	2.79
45. Toronto (Metro)	15,500,793	3,565,844	19,066,637	571,454	33.37
46. Victoria	8,372	2,093	10,465	13,405	.78
47. Waterloo	1,228,070	236,753	1,464,823	99,686	14.69
48. Wellington	477,960	73,020	550,980	42,961	12.83
49. York	870,310	212,403	1,082,713	78,445	13.80
	42,490,166	8,186,871	50,677,871	2,621,565	19.33

(1) Municipal share estimated based on 20% of actual expenditures of Province

* Included with Sudbury

Source: Ministry of Community and Social Services, Day Care Policy Background Paper, Table 30, October 1981.

7.

Existing licensed day care facilities in Ontario consist of municipally operated centres, private nonprofit and co-operative centres, supervised private home day care under the administration of private day care agencies, and for profit commercial operations. Unsupervised private home day care for fewer than six children is not yet licensed. Uneven geographical distribution of centre care has been identified as one problem.¹ Another problem is cost. Licensed day care can cost as much as \$100 per week, depending on the age of the child. Affordability of supervised care for those parents who fall just outside the subsidy criteria becomes a crucial problem. The Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto has stated:

Survey results document an expressed preference among parents of virtually all social classes and ethnic backgrounds, for supervised and licensed group care for pre-school children. The data reveal, however, that under existing market conditions, only those parents at the top and the bottom extremes of the income scale can utilize this mode of child care.²

The usual alternative is to have children cared for by babysitters in unsupervised private homes where quality of care cannot be easily gauged by the parent. Custodial care of this kind has been reported to consist of,

few creative activities, considerable television viewing, and a program structured more around the caregiver's housekeeping responsibilities than the developmental needs of children.³

At present, the Province sets minimum standards for supervised care and the individual centre or agency may improve upon quality standards. For example, Metro Toronto sets a higher than minimum provincial standard when it enters into purchase of service agreements with private day care agencies.

¹For an analysis of need and levels of service in Metropolitan Toronto see: Metropolitan Toronto Day Care Planning Task Force, Future Directions for Day Care Services in Metropolitan Toronto, September 1980, Section 3, p. 13, and: Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, Planning Agenda for the Eighties: Part II: Metro's Suburbs in Transition, "Child Welfare and Family Support", September 1980, pp. 184 - 199.

²Social Planning Council, 100,000 Children: Alternatives For Service Delivery, A Report of the Project Child Care Policy Task Force, November 1979, p. 2.

³Ibid., p. 14.

Responsible private day care organizations make their own judgements and set their own standards of quality, resulting in a mixed system. The newly proposed provincial standards and guidelines for day nurseries will attempt to improve and regulate the quality of care. In particular, group care and private home day care will be upgraded and regulations presented in clearer form. Every private home day care agency will be required to be licensed and to conform to prescribed standards of operation. Staff qualifications will require the employment of a supervisor who has a diploma in early childhood education or equivalent competency as the minimum standard. The educative function inherent in day care is thereby recognized. However, the Ministry views diverse approaches to programming and divided responsibilities for provision of day care as valid and acceptable. It states:

Whatever the reason a child is enrolled in a day nursery, and whatever the scope of the program offered, the child's well-being and development should be the shared concerns of those responsible for initiating, providing and monitoring the program.¹

The Ministry at present is determined not to expand its function beyond setting the ground rules, subsidizing low income parents and encouraging individuals and organizations to start up day care centres. Five principles govern Ontario's day care policy:

- 1) to assist parents in the child rearing function;
- 2) to promote diversity of service sponsorship and program philosophy;
- 3) to have local government act as the central planning agency and make day care available;
- 4) to provide public funds for those most in need;
- 5) to ensure relatively equal access of public resources for families of similar financial and social circumstances.²

¹Children's Services Division, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Day Nurseries Services: Proposed Standards and Guidelines, February 1980, p. 21.

²Ministry of Community and Social Services, Statement by the Honourable Keith Norton, Minister of Community and Social Services, M.P.P., Kingston and the Islands, Concerning Day Care Policy and Funding, Thursday, December 18, 1980.

Its lack of financial commitment limits the extent to which these goals may be achieved. In response to public pressure, the Province announced an \$11 million package of funding incentives on December 18, 1980. It focuses on privately operated programs and reaffirms the policy that parents are primarily responsible for basic care. For example, capital funding for start-up grants have been allotted to nonprofit parent boards and employee-employer boards. 1,500 additional subsidized spaces (500 in Metropolitan Toronto) were granted and apply to privately operated programs. This has met with criticism from day care groups across Ontario.

It is clear that the path chosen by the Province is to promote diversity of sponsorship. The Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto has advocated that a universal partial day care subsidy be established which would apply to all parents, with additional subsidies to parents in the lower income brackets.¹ Universal day care would be difficult to implement in the present set-up for federal-provincial cost sharing. Federal grants of 50% depend on provincial and local initiatives which vary from province to province. A disproportionate federal share is paid out to provinces which are most active. Furthermore, not all proponents of universal day care agree on how it should best be implemented. Understandably, each group seeks to further its own interest to some degree.

The single most urgent problem is the need to increase the number of day care spaces particularly for infants and toddlers, and the number of subsidized spaces. Province-wide statistics on labour force participation rates of women with children indicate that 55.7% of such women worked in 1979 as compared to 48.0% in 1975. By age group of child, 45.2% of mothers with children under three years of age and 54.5% with children between three and five years worked. These statistics indicate increases since 1975 of 25.9% in working mothers with children under three, 10.6% in working mothers with children three to five years, and an overall increase of 18.6% of working mothers with children up to 15 years.²

¹Social Planning Council, 100,000 Children: Alternatives For Service Delivery, p. 2.

²The Women's Bureau, Ontario Ministry of Labour, Women in the Labour Force "Child Care" Update (undated).

When ascertaining need, waiting lists at existing centres and projections for subsidized day care spaces over the next five years paint a very startling picture. In 1979 the Social Planning Council looked at day care centre waiting lists in Metropolitan Toronto. A sample survey of 69 centres provided a total of 6,931 day care spaces. Discounting the possibility of overlaps on waiting lists, these centres collectively had 1,628 names on waiting lists. This represented 23.5% of their total capacity. Translating the sample data to the total population resulted in an estimated 2,539 children on day care centre waiting lists in Metropolitan Toronto in 1979.¹

The Metropolitan Toronto Day Care Planning Task Force found that a total of 1,359 additional subsidized spaces were required for Metropolitan Toronto in order to reach equal distribution of present service levels.² Following completion of equity, it was recommended that subsidized day care be increased by 6,049 spaces over a five year period in order to meet the need for subsidized care for 6% of the 1979 child population between zero to nine years. Their calculations imply an average increase of 680 subsidized spaces for the first two years, and an additional 1,210 spaces for each of the subsequent five years. This will result in a total of 15,022 subsidized spaces by 1987.³ Community response recorded in the final report released April 13, 1981 was unanimous in viewing these increases as extremely modest.

Among its many recommendations for the achievement of equity of service and increasing facilities, the Metropolitan Toronto Day Care Planning Task Force suggests that workplace day care should be considered a feasible option under certain circumstances. Under present conditions of affordability gaps and dearth of high quality day care spaces, this option merits further investigation.

Ontario has been a leader in recognizing day care as an essential social service but unfortunately has failed to keep pace with growing demand and to extend the service to cover the needs of the middle income family. This means that it has fallen short of lifting day care provisions out of the

¹Action Day Care and Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, Effects of Government Spending Restraints on Day Care Services in Metro Toronto, April 1980.

²Metropolitan Toronto Day Care Planning Task Force, op. cit., p. 21.

³Ibid., p. 78.

welfare service level. The Province is promoting a diverse delivery system, however, since statistics on present and future needs can no longer be ignored. One of its fiscal incentives (\$4.3 million) is specifically directed toward promoting the establishment of employer-employee and parent initiated boards working toward the establishment of nonprofit day care centres. It is now incumbent upon the community to take advantage of this opportunity and to press for further financial support. It is from this basis and the current situation of unmet needs that this investigation into workplace and work-related day care is being carried out.

III WORKPLACE DAY CARE -- ANOTHER OPTION

Workplace day care is not a new idea. It existed in the 1940's when women were needed in the labour force but ceased with the close of wartime production. In the 1960's and 1970's women returned to work in increasing numbers and, more recently, a depressed economy and inflation have accelerated the rate of growth of women in the labour force. Workplace day care is again being considered, both from the point of view of the working parent and the employer. The Ontario Advisory Council on Day Care has stated that contributions toward day care costs by business and industry have not been provided, yet they benefit most from having day care available for the children of their employees.¹ The report recommends encouraging and stimulating employers to become involved, and that the Provincial government should lead the way by providing day care for its staff. The Project Child Care Policy Task Force sponsored jointly by the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto and the Children's Day Care Coalition examined the range of private day care options in Metropolitan Toronto between 1975 and 1980. Their data revealed that many more group day care spaces were needed and one of their recommendations was:

that employers and trade unions become involved in providing day care directly to those families who desire workplace day care.²

Metro Toronto's Day Care Planning Task Force completed a working paper for community discussion in September 1980. It addressed day care policy, the uneven distribution of existing facilities, planning for equity and projected requirements, the role of boards of education, and special needs children. Consideration for providing day care in the workplace was also among its terms of reference, and it recommended that:

workplace day care be promoted as an integral component of day care provision in Metro.³

¹Ontario Advisory Council on Day Care, Final Report, January 1976, Ministry of Community and Social Services, p. 25.

²Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 100,000 Children: Alternatives For Service Delivery, p. 4.

³Metropolitan Toronto Day Care Planning Task Force, op. cit., p. 60.

The general sentiment seems to be that workplace day care ought to be a component of a diverse network of day care services.

Diversity of Service Delivery and Rationale for Workplace Day Care

Various types of day care operations fill their roles in different ways. For example, municipal and government operated day care centres give priority to families with greatest need and are most likely to include spaces for children with special needs. They are also more expensive since staff salaries are usually 15% to 20% higher than salaries in privately operated centres or home day care.¹ Nonprofit community board and parent co-operative centres provide for greatest possible participation. Supervised private home day care is the setting often preferred by parents of younger children. Commercially operated centres increase the availability of services to middle and upper income groups. Because of the affordability gap for families just beyond qualifying criteria, the dearth of good quality group care, and the inherent benefits to both users and providers, it seems logical to promote the establishment of workplace day care as another alternative in a diverse system.

Workplace day care can compensate for gaps in existing services. For example, in many respects day care centres do not meet community needs. Children must be dropped off and collected within specified times. Frequently, centres are not located within the community in which the parent lives or works and getting there entails extra travelling time. Day care for parents who work shifts, weekends and holidays is virtually non-existent.² Acute shortage of group care may make it impossible for parents to find day care. Prohibitive costs and the limited number of subsidized spaces force parents to seek less desirable arrangements for care and force single parents onto welfare. Workplace day care has been considered especially suitable for younger children. It eliminates the problem of lack of contact between parent and child for long periods of the day, and has particular significance for nursing mothers.

¹Ministry of National Health and Welfare, op. cit., p. 9.

²See Globe and Mail, "Day-and-Night care eases families' load", April 2, 1981.

One of the major arguments against workplace day care has centred on location. Environmental hazards and transportation in urban areas have been cited as the main drawbacks. It is not suggested that factories with unfavourable environments should provide on-site day care. One of the present economic realities points to the fact that manufacturing jobs are dwindling and that service industries are growing. Many of these rely heavily on a female labour force. Workplace day care functions well in places with "clean" environments such as hospitals, universities, schools, government and large service sector industries. It is particularly suited to plants located in suburban or rural locations where the private automobile is the required mode of travel.

Where on-site day care is impractical, employer participation in day care can take on a variety of other forms. The Ontario Ministry of Labour cites numerous possibilities: monthly child care allowances; counselling or referral services to assist employees in locating good child care in family day care homes; purchasing spaces for employee use in existing day care centres; providing vouchers toward purchase of child care services; guaranteed payments for the cost of child care during over-time; or donating organizational or administrative expertise, space, maintenance services and utilities.¹ In whichever way employers become involved in day care, it will have a positive impact on the day care picture and benefit the company or organization.

Over a decade ago, the Committee for Economic Development in the United States stated that business must recognize that the pursuit of profit and social objectives can be made complementary. It recommended that in order to realize social goals, a system of incentives be developed, such as tax benefits, loans, credit, guarantees, cash subsidies, etc.² What follows are precedents of workplace day care in the United States. They serve to show the employers' points of view and the benefits perceived by them. Participation has been grouped into a number of models which constitute direct involvement in day care.

¹Women's Bureau, Ontario Ministry of Labour, Workplace Child Care: A Background Paper, January 20, 1981, pp. 25-26.

²Committee for Economic Development, Social Responsibilities of Business Corporations, June 1971.

Five Developmental Models

One of the early and most comprehensive providers of workplace day care was Kaiser Shipyards of Portland, Oregon, engaged in wartime production. Services at two family centres encompassed 24-hour day care with preschool programs set by expert early childhood educators of the day, programs for children on holidays, parent counselling, facilities for medical care, and services such as mending, shopping and hot take-home meals for parents of children enrolled at the centre. This and other day care centres closed with the end of the war with a return to the view that a woman's place was in the home. In the late 60's and early 70's, and with the growing female participation in the labour force, a number of United States companies became involved in day care. A Conference on Industry and Day Care held in Chicago in 1970 identified five models of participation.¹

1. The company-community program exists on the premise that industry is indebted to the community and vice-versa and that there can be no real separation between the two. Working people must be rewarded in terms of upgrading their skills and building of hopes. If this is not done, the community pays for it in welfare, hospitalization and police work. Large conglomerates are involved in day care not as an end in itself, but in order to demonstrate good corporate citizenship. Avco Corporation, Printing Division, founded in 1969, and located at Roxbury, Mass. is cited as one example. Avco is a highly diversified corporation employing about 28,000 people. It located its printing division in this particular suburb to create jobs in an economically deprived, black community. The Division employed approximately 130 people and included a day care centre to serve employees as well as the community. The company provided space and equipment and the centre was associated with the University of Boston. Although the printing division was sold in 1976, the centre still operates, serving the community. Company-community programs address themselves to the larger social issues of education and the prevention of social problems. It was found that this type of industry-related day care program is community-based and open to the community as well as to company employees. It receives

¹Urban Research Corporation, Proceedings of the Conference on Industry and Day Care, Chicago, Illinois, 1970, pp. 10 and 12.

a lot of financial input from the company, including start-up and operating expenses. The latter may include other assistance such as maintenance and security, food from the company cafeteria, the services of the company nurse, supplies, etc. As in Ontario, opening services to the community qualifies projects for federal aid in the United States.

2. The individual company program maintains a positive attitude toward what day care can do for the company. Its primary purpose for involvement is to control high turnover rates and to attract qualified workers. Even though the day care centre operates at a loss, the company considers itself compensated in the cost of hiring and training. The companies represented were Vanderbilt Shirt Company of Asherville, North Carolina, employing 306 women; Mr. Apparel Company of High Point, North Carolina, employing 400 women; and Skyline Textile Company of Morganton, North Carolina, employing 700 women. Turnover rates in all three companies were practically eliminated after experience with day care. For example, at Vanderbilt Shirt Company, turnover was reduced to practically nil after an eight month experience with day care, while it was 72% among women who did not have children in the day care centre and as high as 80% to 90% in other companies. The day care operating losses were given at between \$12,000 to \$15,000 and were balanced off by a reduced turnover by as few as 15 employees per year when turnover costs per employee were calculated at \$1,000. Skyline Textile Company's day care program cost \$16,000 in employer subsidies in the first six months of operation. The basic reason for providing day care was to reduce the high turnover, but it also experienced intangible benefits in advertising by providing the day care program. Management's paternalistic attitude toward employees and a sense of responsibility toward the community were also instrumental in getting the program underway. This was not the philosophy of Vanderbilt Shirt Company who felt that the primary responsibility of a company was to provide the payroll. It agreed, however, that industry had begun to develop a social conscience.

All the companies provided all the services and paid for start-up costs from between \$15,000 and \$98,000. Operating costs were partially paid for by parental fees, with companies making up the difference between fees and costs. Skyline Textile and Vanderbilt Shirt Co. day care

centres have closed, as have some others started in the 1960's. A survey of 18 employers who closed centre operations reflected that a major oversight by business was that good day care is expensive.

Intermedics of Freeport, Texas opened a day care centre for its employees in 1978 to help alleviate tardiness and absenteeism. It is estimated that it costs \$220 a month per child to operate the centre. 250 children were enrolled one year after the centre opened. The expense is shared between parent and company. The parental fee is \$60 and the company's share \$160. However, a 46% tax rate reduces the actual cost to be absorbed by the company to \$74 and it is estimated that the net cost to the company per child is \$86. In return, a 9% reduction in turnover has been achieved and approximately 3700 man hours saved by reduced absenteeism over the first six months of operation.¹

3. The Federal Government. The United States Department of Labour in Washington, D.C., opened a day care centre in October 1968. Originally it was intended to provide a service for mothers being trained for employment in government. However, the need of the employee has been recognized. A responsive employer will get a more productive, motivated employee, free of anxiety, as a result of providing day care. Programs must also be developmentally oriented from the point of view of the child and not purely from an economic viewpoint. The Department of Labour day care centre was the first government sponsored program for employees and charged fees from \$1 to \$30 per week on a sliding scale.² A number of other child care centres have been developed by the federal government since that time. For example, a centre was started for employees of the Senate, the House, the Supreme Court and Library of Congress in Washington. They continue to be subsidized by being given free space which often includes the cost of maintenance and utilities. The Department of Labour has experienced improved attendance and employees have been better able to concentrate on their jobs. Educational and social benefits are considered even more important but are difficult to measure.³

¹Dana Friedman, "Child Care in the 80's - Reaching Out to Business and Labour", Child Care Information on Exchange, #9, Nov., 1980.

²Urban Research Corporation, op. cit., p. 19.

³The United States Army, Marine Corps and Navy also sponsor day care centres at military installations. These provide care for children during working and leisure hours and are more akin to a community service.

4. The KLH Child Development Centre -- a research demonstration project. This project was a short-term model which owed its existence to the interest and initiative of a single individual -- the President of KLH Company in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The company employed 300 women, of which 150 had children eligible for day care. The centre was begun in 1968 as a nonprofit entity to serve as a research demonstration project. Start-up costs of \$80,000 were financed by the federal government, private individuals and foundations. The centre even survived a company takeover. It served children of employees and surrounding communities and charged fees on a sliding scale. Its board was run by parents who were released from work to attend meetings. Parents' fees accounted for 30% of annual operating costs (around \$117,000), KLH paid 20%, and federal day care assistance programs paid 50%. A number of children received government subsidies. The centre consciously focused on child development. Others have come into existence, for example the Broadcasters Child Development Centre in Washington, D.C. and the Northside Child Development Centre in Minneapolis. The latter was established by Control Data Corporation in conjunction with Dayton-Hudson, Minnesota Federal Reserve Bank, Northwestern Bell, Northern State Power Co., Farmers and Mechanics Savings and Loan, Pillsbury, and the Lutheran Brotherhood Insurance Company. These firms provided funds which were matched by the federal government for start-up in 1971. The centre provides a developmental curriculum and in 1977 served as many as 128 children. The University of Minnesota was hired to conduct a study of the centre's effect on employee turnover, absenteeism and work performance which supported the premise that turnover and absenteeism are decreased as a result of child enrollment in a company day care program.¹
5. The industry-community partnership is exemplified by a group of 26 business and industrial leaders in Benton Harbour, Michigan. In 1967 a group was formed which called itself the Area Resources Improvement Council. Members had worked individually for community betterment but joined forces to achieve more co-ordination. Day care came to the attention of the Council through its Training and Employment Committee.

¹Dana Friedman, op. cit., pp. 5, 6.

In 1968 a day care centre was developed for the whole community in the form of a nonprofit body. Financially, it was supported by private funds from business and foundations, with various forms of assistance by Whirlpool Corporation, and gifts from different sources in the community. Federal funds were restricted to publicly funded day care spaces within the centre resulting in 75% of operating costs being paid by the Agriculture Department, and 25% through contributions by fees. It was expected to benefit the community, business and industry involved in the project and to educate people to the principle of self support.

More recently, a United States survey of employer sponsored child care centres identified 105 centres with an estimated enrollment of 8,419 children. Sponsors included 75 hospitals, 14 government agencies, 9 industries and 7 labour unions. The average length of operation was 7.6 years, and average fees charged were \$24.21 per week. One labour union centre and one hospital centre charge no fees. The average total operating budget was \$107,270 for 36 civilian centres. Since the completion of the survey in 1978, six new industry sponsored centres have opened. It was also found that most centres were located in or close to the employees' places of work.¹

These five models of workplace and industry related day care show that the corporate sector in the United States has become involved in day care in a variety of ways and for a variety of reasons. These include good corporate citizenship and the accompanying prestige, direct benefits in terms of enhanced control over a stable labour force, attracting qualified employees, and a more highly productive labour force, measured by improved attendance and better concentration. The effects of workplace day care on turnover and absenteeism were perceived to be positive by employers in the textile industry in North Carolina. This view is confirmed by a study conducted by the University of Minnesota on the Northside Child Development Centre in Minneapolis. However, in 1972 an American study on employer subsidized child care concluded that, based strictly on cost benefit criteria, company involvement was not likely to develop rapidly. It is therefore necessary for companies to approach workplace and work-related day care with a combination of self-interest and good corporate citizenship. The survey found:

¹Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labour, Child Care Centers Sponsored by Employers and Labour Unions in the United States, 1980, pp. 2-8.

a growing trend toward corporate community centres. Several well-known corporate centres have recently expanded their programs to include community resources and children. Corporate efforts are designed to improve child care throughout the community, not just for children of company employees.¹

Intangible benefits to corporations and government agencies accrue in advertising and an enhanced public image. Wider effects of benefits to society are of an educational and social nature with the expectation of reduced welfare rolls and greater contribution to the economy on the whole. In the provision of day care, three major beneficiaries are identified: 1) the parents; 2) the industrial organization that hires the mothers; and 3) government or the community agency, because of strong educational aspects and spin-off effects on welfare costs. It was, therefore, concluded by the Conference on Day Care, that funding should come from a combination of these same beneficiaries.

Costs

Costs of day care centres are commonly divided into start-up and operating costs. In the cases reported at the Conference, start-up costs were either government funded, paid for by the individual company, or covered by combined contributions from business, private donors and foundations. Costs varied widely according to whether existing space was used or whether plans involved a new building. Operating costs were shared between companies and parents, or government as employer and parents. Many employers provided additional services in kind. The share borne by parents varied considerably and ranged from 10% to 55% of annual operating costs. The employer frequently contributed other services. Where subsidized day care spaces were included, government contributions accounted for part, or all, of those parental fees. Results of a 1978 survey also showed that employer-sponsored child care centres reduce costs to parents when compared to costs at alternate centres.²

¹Donald O'Gilvie, Employer-Subsidized Child Care, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Inner City Fund, Washington, January 1972, p.7.

²Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labour, op. cit., p. 8.

Similarly, cost sharing provisions in effect in Ontario allow employer/employee boards, formed to set up a workplace nonprofit day care centre, to take advantage of government funding for start-up costs. The cost of operating expenses may be shared between employer and employee or with government when subsidized spaces for low income families are included. Corporations derive tax benefits from involvement in day care, since virtually all costs to an employer are tax deductible. Thus, subsidized child care payments made to the employee, subsidies to an existing nonprofit day care centre, or covering operating losses or hidden subsidy services all are current expenses and reduce a company's tax liability.¹ Start-up costs and purchase of equipment are capital expenses and may be amortized. A private nonprofit day care centre including one established by an employer, is usually set up as a separate nonprofit entity and qualifies as a charitable organization. As such, it is open to participation by the entire community and cannot exclusively be established for children of employees of one or more companies.

Employees who are subsidized by virtue of direct child care payments, vouchers or reimbursements from the employer must treat this as a taxable benefit. Their participation in subsidized day care services is not taxable because benefits are not derived by virtue of employment.

¹See: The Financial Post, "Company Day Care Can Pay Dividends", July 25, 1981, p. 20.

IV THE GROWING INTEREST IN CANADA

Workplace day care in Canada exists in isolated instances in various cities across the country. No complete roster could be found. However, in 1978, Health and Welfare Canada listed workplace centres in Victoria, Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and Faro (Yukon). These were being sponsored by a number of hospitals, by the B.C. Government Employees Union, and a parent co-operative. The possibility of workplace day care was then being studied by unions, government agencies and companies. These bodies included the Public Service Alliance in Ottawa; the International Longshoreman's and Warehousemen's Union in Richmond, B.C.; the Department of Social Work, Winnipeg; Manpower Division, Treasury Board Secretariat, Ottawa; The Liberal Party of Canada, Ottawa; New Brunswick Telephone Co., Saint John; and Manufacturers Life Insurance Company in Toronto. Space for a day care centre on Parliament Hill in Ottawa has recently been approved by Madame Speaker Jeanne Sauve and is commended as a model for workplace day care for all federal departments to follow. An ad hoc committee of interested parents is looking at available space and financial requirements for start-up funds and staffing. The centre will be run as a nonprofit co-operative centre. Initially, forty spaces will be made available, some of them subsidized for eligible parents, and it will be open to anyone who works on Parliament Hill. The Province of Ontario employs a day care counsellor who travels throughout the Province to confer with employees and private home day care agencies. She disseminates information about quality and programming to help individuals choose good day care, and helps to share information on availability. The Province does not yet provide day care in the workplace. A paper by the Ontario Ministry of Labour, Women's Bureau, gives an overview of workplace child care in Canada and observes that:

it would appear that there is a growing interest in this type of child care.¹

The following information is based on the Bureau of Municipal Research's investigation of workplace day care. It consists of a survey of business firms located in the Metropolitan Toronto area and interviews of various sectors of the community concerned with day care to determine how each perceives the question of workplace day care.

¹Women's Bureau, Ontario Ministry of Labour, op. cit., p. 13.

The Education Sector

Most universities and community colleges have been involved in day care for some time, either because of early childhood education programs or because students and parents initiated it. These day care centres constitute a form of workplace child care because they are attended by children of staff and students. In the Metropolitan Toronto area, the Institute of Child Study at the University of Toronto and Ryerson Polytechnical Institute have nursery schools and day care centres which form part of their early childhood education programs and date back as far as 1926 and 1960 respectively.

Parent-initiated day care centres are in operation at York University, at the University of Toronto and at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Since the advent of declining enrollment, the Toronto Board of Education has developed a policy to assist parent groups in setting up day care centres in the schools. Schools located in the downtown and industrial areas of the city are becoming involved in work-related day care. Orde Street Public School Day Care Centre is one example. Its day care program began in 1979 because school board employees asked for it and became instrumental in its creation. Priority is given to board employees, however, enrollment extends to the community and to parents working in the area. Another is Jessie Ketchum Nursery Centre where approximately one-third of the children attend because their parents work in the vicinity. Niagara Public School is located in an industrial area and is looking into need for day care in the community. A parent committee is presently working on the proposed program and it is anticipated that employees of nearby factories will be given the opportunity of enrolling their children.

Programs of various kinds are available in different schools and include all day kindergartens, school-age day care, lunch programs, as well as preschool day care. It has been found in Toronto that schools with day care centres enjoy a stabilized enrollment. Start-up funds are generally raised in part by parents, in part by the Board of Education, or are negotiated from Metropolitan Toronto. The schools provide free space and maintenance and the operation becomes self-sufficient through fees. As day care in schools located in industrial and business areas of the city develop, funding may also be negotiated from firms whose employees benefit from it. The Toronto

Board of Education recently announced that it will seek funds from all three levels of government to establish day care centres in all junior public schools by September 1984.¹

Within the education sector, views on how best to implement day care and early childhood education are divided. The Ontario Teachers' Federation is opposed to a fragmented system and quite logically would like to see preschool education incorporated into the education system. Early childhood educators perceive the public school systems as achievement oriented which differs from teaching philosophy involving the young child. Also, if part of the school system, they feel that their status would be reduced to the lowest level in a hierarchical system. The primary mandate of the Association of Early Childhood Educators, however, is to improve the quality of early childhood education and its certification program includes post-training evaluation which constitutes an additional monitoring function on quality. The recently released report by the Commission of Enquiry into the Education of the Young Child, commissioned by several teachers' federations in Ontario, makes many innovative suggestions. Proposals such as the establishment of centres for the family and the education of the young child, and special centres encompassing day care, recreation, education and health care, appear not unlike existing facilities in Scandinavian countries.

Educational institutions have been instrumental in the development of early childhood education and have analysed effects upon children and benefits to society. The involvement of school boards and the neighbourhood school is a recent phenomenon, heralded by declining enrollment. However, involvement in day care is dependent upon jurisdictional policy and few boards are involved. In the City of Toronto, opportunities are expanding for work-related day care to be incorporated into the public schools and much scope for co-operation exists between the corporate and the education sectors.

The Employees and Labour Unions

The Ontario Federation of Labour sponsored a series of public forums on day care from March 30 to April 11, 1981. A summary of its findings will be

¹Toronto Star, "Outside funding key to expanded school day care", June 12, 1981.

presented to the Province of Ontario. The meetings heard deputations from public and private bodies, the day care community, union representatives and individuals in eight municipalities. They included: Kitchener-Waterloo; Windsor; Thunder Bay; Sudbury; Ottawa; Peterborough; Hamilton; and Toronto. At its Toronto session, the following union locals represented the voice of the employee: The Service Employees International Union Local 204 (representing hospital workers); United Steel Workers of America (mining and steel workers); Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 1000 (Ontario Hydro); Local 2316 (Children's Aid Society of Metro Toronto); CUPE Local 79 (Metro Employees Inside Workers); Local 2484 (Day Care Centres); OPSU (Regional 5 Women's Caucus), Local 511 (Surrey Place Centre); OPEIU (Office Professional Employees International Union); Communication Workers of Canada, Local 50 (Bell Canada); the Canadian Union of Postal Workers; and United Auto Workers. All documented the known problems of high cost of group day care, of short supply, and specific work related problems such as shift work, and spoke to the larger issue of day care as a social right.

The Women's Committee of CUPE Local 1000 (Ontario Hydro) presented results of a survey on day care. The survey had been circulated among employees of Ontario Hydro throughout the Province of Ontario. 600 survey questionnaires were returned. In 1979, 2526 union members (17%) were women. Of the women who responded, 70% were married and 10% were single parents. Results indicated that 58% of women respondents use baby sitters, 18% use group day care, and 55% would prefer group day care. The greatest deterrents to the latter were availability, high cost and lack of space for children under two years of age. 68% of women are in favour of bargaining for workplace day care, and the same percentage are in favour of bargaining for some form of assistance.¹

Communications Workers Local 50 (Bell Canada) indicated, among other concerns, that child illness necessitating absence from work resulted in penalties and that added burdens in arranging for child care fell on employees who work shifts. Lack of consideration for these concerns on the part of the employer indicated insensitivity to child and home responsibilities.

¹Submission to O.F.L., Public Forum on Day Care, by the Ontario Hydro Employees' Union, Women's Committee, CUPE Local 1000, Margaret A. Smith Day Care Sub-committee, April 11, 1981.

The labour movement in Canada has been slow in demanding employer participation in day care. In Ontario, the policy of the Ontario Federation of Labour in the 1970's was that "day care centres should be the responsibility of the Provincial Government with responsibility for administration left in the hands of municipalities".¹ It was the position of the labour movement, therefore, to pressure provincial government to put more money into day care, to work towards legislative change, and to undertake educational programs within the labour unions to increase understanding of the problem. Under existing arrangements for provincial funding, it was felt that unions could not establish and run day nurseries at affordable rates. However, the British Columbia Government Employees' Union began operating a day care centre for children of working mothers in Victoria in 1972. In the United States, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America had led the way with day care centres in Baltimore, Virginia and Verona, Maryland. These centres were financed by employer contributions to a joint fund run by union and management.

A 1972 O.F.L. position paper on day care includes a recommendation that the Government of Ontario "promote the establishing of day care centres at places of work. In new plants every effort should be made to have facilities planned and built in".² Its 1980 "Statement on Day Care" reiterates previous policy. It demands universal, publicly-funded, good quality day care, suggesting that workplace day care be considered one option among a number from which parents can choose freely.

A lobby to make day care a bargaining goal may be emerging. The recent O.F.L. sponsored conference on day care revealed that acute shortages of day care facilities exist right across the Province. Clifford Pilkey, President of the O.F.L., has stated that serious consideration is now being given to making day care part of contract negotiations.³ The major reasons preventing this step so far were concerns involving employer-employee relations and divisions within the labour movement. For example, it was feared that day care demands could be used as a lever against better working conditions

¹Report of the Social Services Committee to the Ontario Federation of Labour Executive Board Meeting, September 17, 1971.

²Position Paper on Day Care to the O.F.L. Executive Council Meeting, June 16 and 19, 1972.

³See: Toronto Star, "Unions press employers for day care", April 6, 1981.

for employees or to discriminate against women in employment practices; it was considered that day care, as a social responsibility, should be under government jurisdiction; and not a minor point is the fact that the major proportion of trade unionists are male, who do not perceive day care as their issue, but view it as a women's issue. This point was borne out by the CUPE Local 1000 survey referred to earlier. It determined that although 68% of women are in favour of bargaining for workplace day care, 73% of male respondents did not agree. Furthermore, 72% of women perceived day care to be a social right, whereas 71% of men indicated to the contrary.¹

It appears that bargaining by the unions will continue to concentrate on such other priorities as job security, occupational health and safety, and layoffs. In the foreseeable future, day care probably will be a bargaining issue only in female labour intensive industries. CUPE Local 2189 (Young Women's Christian Association) consists mostly of women. It provides an example of how child care issues can be worked out by a local that is sensitive to the issue. Its collective agreement has included child care provisions since 1976. The idea of a day care centre proved impractical for employees whose jobs were dispersed throughout the city. A settlement was reached in favour of subsidies to help defray the cost of child care. In 1976, the amount was \$15.00 per month per employee with one or more children and rose to \$30 by 1980. A number of other provisions important to family life are in the contract: notably, cumulative sick leave in order to care for a sick child or other family member; maternity leave of six months, one week at full pay to cover the period not paid for by unemployment insurance, or if male, a one-week paid leave of absence to take care of needs related to the birth or adoption of his child with an option for another two weeks' leave without pay; and reimbursement of reasonable expenses for child care when working unusual hours. Canadian Union of Postal Workers recently paved the way for unionized or non-unionized employees to seek improved maternity benefits.

¹Submission to O.F.L. Public Forum on Day Care by CUPE Local 1000, Ontario Hydro, Margaret A. Smith, Day Care Sub-committee, April 11, 1981.

The Employers

The Bureau's survey of the business community netted 26 responses to a mail-out of 220 questionnaires. Answers in most instances were provided by the Personnel Department. The small sample resulting from the mail-out makes generalization about the total population difficult. However, some definite patterns emerged which are of interest.

Of the responding firms, most were located in downtown Toronto and the percentages of female labour ranged from a low of 25% to a high of 80%. Most respondents expected their female/male ratio of employees to remain the same over the next ten years, although some anticipated an increase in the number of women employees in the future.¹ Staff turnover averaged about 19% and absenteeism was less than 5% among them. The majority employed between 500 and 2,000 people. Company benefits at about half the firms included flexible working hours and paid days off for reason of family illness. Additional maternity leave at no pay was also frequently granted. Additional leave with pay was the exception, however.

The question of workplace day care had not been considered in the majority of firms. Where it had, the idea originated either with employees or with human resources management departments and did not lead to concrete action. When asked about becoming involved in specific ways, almost two thirds of the respondents indicated mild interest in one or several ways. Of the suggested possibilities, sponsorship of a day care centre to which a firm would contribute start-up funds or donating funds to an existing centre were most often mentioned. Next in frequency of mention were pooling of financial resources with other firms to set up a centre, or providing an allowance to employees applicable to day care. Companies were less enthusiastic about providing space on-site or donating expertise, services or goods. To some degree, locational constraints are at work in the downtown core with regard to space. If companies were to become involved, however, they cited good

¹Employment and Immigration Minister Lloyd Axworthy in a speech to the Human Resources Planning Conference in Toronto spoke of important changes occurring in the structure of the supply of labour. One of these was the strong participation rate of adult women. It is expected that female participation will continue over the decade, so that 70% of labour force growth will result from the increase of the numbers of adult women in the work force.

employee relations, good corporate citizenship and facilitating staff recruitment as the most likely reasons. Over half the firms felt they would perhaps become involved if others were. The Social Services and Housing Committee of Metropolitan Toronto, responding to "Future Directions for Day Care Services In Metropolitan Toronto" recently addressed recommendations related to the promotion of day care in the workplace. It recommended, with the concurrence of the Executive Committee, that action be taken to develop a consultative group from business and industry to implement a program of promoting workplace day care.

Historically, hospitals were among the first employers to become involved in providing on-site day care. For example, Riverdale Hospital in Toronto was motivated to set up a nursery for its employees in 1964. This was due to a shortage of nursing staff and day care was thought to help attract staff. The hospital had approximately 250 employees in 1964 and was only able to serve 160 of its 800 bed capacity. Day care helped recruit about 150 employees within six months. The day care nursery was begun with three children and had 35 children enrolled within six months. Today, the staff is 900, and there are 40 children enrolled on either a full or part-time basis. A policy change from fixed to varying shifts has reduced the need for weekend care but now provides the service on a part-time basis in addition to all day care. This is a service not generally available in other centres. Start-up was financed by the hospital and the nursery has been in continuous operation under the direct jurisdiction of the hospital board. Fees are \$11 per day or \$50 a week, and provision is made for shift overlap. Children may also be left for half a day. The nursery operates on a deficit of between \$15,000 to \$20,000 per year which is picked up by the hospital. There are other subsidies such as maintenance, cafeteria, carpentry and laundry services.

Winnipeg's Health Sciences Centre, an amalgamation of several hospitals, has operated a day nursery since 1975 and is presently caring for 160 children of staff and students, aged from three months to school age. About 150 children are on a waiting list. The nursery was initially assisted by the Government of Manitoba in the form of maintenance grants per child, amounting to approximately \$60,000. The day nursery constitutes a separate department of the Health Sciences Centre and a sub-committee, composed of the director, parents, hospital administrators, makes policy recommendations to the hospital board. Its budget is overspent by \$17,000 to \$20,000 per annum,

which the hospitals pay. Fees per day are \$1 above the provincial maximum of \$8.50. One year ago, the nursery was given the option of charging this additional amount. The hospital has continued to fund deficits and remains committed to providing a high quality program. A referral service is being developed for desperate parents and the hospital is exploring extended services to cover evenings, nights and weekends because of demand and a desire to recruit nurses to offset staff shortages.

Toronto's Hospital for Sick Children is planning a day care centre. The hospital proposes to sponsor a program of excellent quality which will serve also as a research and teaching resource. The centre is to be operated under autonomous, nonprofit status in order to qualify for provincial subsidy and its governing board will include representatives from the hospital and the parents. It is not yet clear if the facilities will be open to all employees. The hospital views the proposed centre not only as a recruiting tool but also as a prestige enhancing resource. Workplace day care was rejected in 1975 because projected operating deficits were too high. It will now go ahead if most, or all, of estimated start-up costs of \$140,000 will be covered by provincial funding. Space will be provided by the hospital, but no additional subsidy such as food or maintenance is planned. It expects to cover operating expenses by charging market rates (presently between \$80 and \$90 per week) and has not, so far, considered applying for subsidized spaces. If the Ministry of Community and Social Services (Government of Ontario) approves the entire start-up cost, the grant will account for 11% of the total allotment for parent and employer-employee boards across the Province.

Bell Canada employees are spread across Ontario in urban, downtown and suburban locations. The total Ontario labour force consists of approximately 27,000 employees, half of them women. Many jobs require twenty-four hour coverage. The Personnel Department investigated workplace day care five years ago and again in 1981. The investigation included interviewing companies involved in day care in Canada and the United States, examining results of conferences and seminars and information contained in periodicals and statistics on costs. The initial investigation found costs to be prohibitive, and day care was considered difficult to administer equitably. Therefore, both assessments concluded that Bell would not become a participant in workplace day care but would remain aware of

developments. No survey of employees has been undertaken in the process.

Manufacturer's Life Insurance Company has shown that employers can involve themselves in day care in other ways. Its Toronto head office employs 1,500 people, 900 or 60% are female. After studying all aspects of the results of a 1973 needs study, it was concluded that existing resources in the community sufficed. A 1976 company task force on women reopened the question. One recommendation was to obtain priority for a number of day care spaces for employees in a nearby day care centre. In 1978, Manufacturer's Life contributed \$12,000 towards renovation of Hilda Roberts Day Care Centre and secured priority spaces for its employees. The centre is presently licensed for a total of 52 spaces (35 preschool and 17 infant and toddler spaces). Manulife employees occupy ten centre spaces and pay the same rate as do other users, that is, \$355 per month for infants and toddlers, and \$295 per month for preschool children. There is a long waiting list for all age groups, but particularly for infants and toddlers. Whenever space becomes available, a Manulife employee on the waiting list is given priority. A review of the current arrangements was commenced in Spring 1981, and culminated in further financial assistance to Hilda Roberts Day Care Centre. In addition to previous arrangements, all six of the centre's infant spots are reserved for use by Manulife employees and are held open up to nine months. In the future, the company will keep records of the child care requirements of its staff in order to gauge needs. The company also operates a counselling service providing information on maternity leave and day care availability through its health centre and staff association.

Canada Life Assurance Company is keeping aware of developments but is not contemplating becoming involved in day care at present. The company recently conducted an attitude survey and, although no question addressed day care directly, it was not considered to be an expressed need because the topic did not arise from among its employees. Management considers day care difficult to administer as a benefit, since it is not universally applicable. Two-thirds of its 1,350 employees are women.

Shell Canada's Data Centre is located in the suburb of Don Mills - potentially a very good location for on-site day care, in well-landscaped, open surroundings. 63% of its employees are women, of which 54% are under the age of 35. In 1975 a needs study was undertaken by the Employee Relations

Department to determine day care need. 358 questionnaires were returned by employees constituting 53.6% of the total distributed. 167 had a total of 359 children and 95 were under the age of five. 17 or 18.3% were enrolled in day care centres, 35 or 36.7% were in informal home care, and the remaining 43 children or 45% were being cared for by relatives (wives or mothers of employees). Four indicated dissatisfaction with present arrangements. The conclusion was reached that requirements for change to existing day care arrangements of employees were low. The Employee Relations Department provides counselling services where need arises. No liaison exists between companies located within the industrial complex in connection with the possible pooling of needs and resources to provide workplace day care. Shell Canada has expressed continuing interest in developments, demonstrably by donating \$1,000 to a Spring 1981 conference on work-related day care, sponsored jointly by the Social Planning Council and the University of Toronto Child In The City Program.

The views of the Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto are perhaps indicative of concerns of the business community. The Board's Planning and Urban Affairs Committee produced a paper entitled "Day Care Services in Metropolitan Toronto" in 1979. Its approach centres on best use of tax dollars and the most efficient way of meeting social and economic needs. Concerns were expressed that "a fix on true demand and locational planning be founded on a sound basis". Recommendations centre on improving present effectiveness and efficiency. It is suggested, for example, that staff/child ratios be re-examined and, if no detrimental effect is found, ratios be increased; a greater percentage of spaces be arranged by purchase of service in supervised private homes, as opposed to setting up additional day care centres; or co-operative purchasing among day care centres of administrative services such as bookkeeping and maintenance, and goods such as food and general supplies. For the long range, recommendations included allocation of funds for an analysis of trends and future expectations and for planning to meet expected needs. It was suggested that cost and short and long term benefits to society should be better understood before changing the scale of subsidization. The study did not touch upon employer involvement in helping to meet present or expected needs. The greater part of respondents (responses coming from the Personnel Departments) to the Bureau's questionnaire indicated that they did not feel that day care should be an employer's responsibility.

Yet, Family Day Care Services, a private nonprofit day care agency in Toronto, is presently working with senior executives of fifteen Mississauga companies and is assessing interest and need among employees. They are also analyzing tax implications for both employers and employees. The agency offers a range of services to corporations for developing either private home care or centre care programs. Services may include recruitment of a program director, supervisors and staff, making applications for licensing and layout of physical space, organization and programming, etc., in conformity with provincial as well as local regulations. Approximate yearly cost for private home day care is quoted as ranging between \$1,600 and \$3,700 per child, depending on the age of the child and hours of daily care. Centre care is estimated at \$3,900 per child per year. These costs can be shared in various ways between employer and employee.¹

A new concept in distributing employee benefits is the "cafeteria-style fringe benefits package". In addition to regular core benefits such as medical and life insurance, and retirement pension schemes, the employer offers a variety of optional benefits from which the individual employee chooses according to needs and life style. This system solves the problem of universal applicability and equitable benefits. A maximum value per employee is set on optional benefits and choices can range from membership in a golf club or a fitness program to educational training and day care.

In order to show that workplace day care can become a reality, we cite Hester How Day Care Centre at Toronto's City Hall. It works despite its less than ideal location, and provides insights into how need is determined, how employee participation is elicited, and gives an indication of the fiscal requirements involved in start-up and operating expenses. It constitutes an employer subsidized model which makes available day care at lower than market cost to the employee.

Hester How Day Care Centre - An Employer Subsidized Model

The day care question was first raised at Toronto City Hall in reports to the Mayor's Task Force on The Status of Women in 1974. No action followed and the issue was reopened by Alderman David White in the late 70's. Two

¹Family Day Care Services, "Workplace Day Care", July 1981.

circumstances are credited with its progression toward becoming a reality: John Sewell, a single father, was mayor; and space happened to come available within City Hall. 1979 being the International Year of the Child, undoubtedly also had an impact in propelling the project.

1. Determining Need and Organization

The City's 4,000 employees were surveyed about their interest in an on-site day care centre. Two questionnaires were distributed to all civic employees with their pay envelopes and a third flyer served as a registration form (see Appendix I). Employees were asked details about the number of preschool children, their interest in using an on-site centre if it were available, and their present child care expenses. The second questionnaire asked about total gross household income, the cost of child care and the amount the family would be prepared to pay; number and age of children now needing day care or who would require day care later was also determined. The likelihood of publicly subsidized spaces was announced. 100 employees expressed an interest in enrolling their children. A core group of interested parents became involved immediately and formed part of the interim operating board, together with representatives of the Planning and Development Department, of three unions (COTAPSA, CUPE 79 and CUPE 43) and one appointee each from the Mayor's office and the Metropolitan Chairman. Committees were established and made all preliminary plans. By February 1980, the final report was before the Executive Committee and the Director of Budgets. The report included recommendations by the Sub-committee on Program and Hiring on eligibility, and an estimated Budget stood at \$95,778 for the first seven months of operation.¹ (See Appendix II)

Hester How Day Care Centre was incorporated as a nonprofit day care centre and began operations in September 1980 with 25 of its 50 spaces filled. It is guided by a Board of Directors which will have thirteen members when permanently established. Six are to be parents, three staff, one for each of the unions at City Hall and one representative of the Metro Chairman's office and the Mayor's office. All day care policy is decided by the Board. Priority for enrollment is given to single parents and low income workers within City Hall and includes other factors such as number of children in the

¹Report by Commissioner of Planning and Development, to City of Toronto Executive Committee, "Feasibility of a Day Care Centre Serving City Hall Employees", February 8, 1980, Appendix C "City Hall Day Care Centre Operating Budget Estimates, June 1 to December 31, 1980".

family and emergency situations. Second priority is given to those working for the municipality outside City Hall; next in line are two parent families working within City Hall and then those working at other locations; next come these same categories with higher income levels, and non-municipal staff working within City Hall. Finally, the centre is also open to any person from outside the employ of the municipality.

2. Start-Up Costs and Subsidies

Renovation of the space was undertaken by the City's property department and costs are expected to be under \$128,000 when final figures are in. City and Metro Council each granted \$20,000 (for a total of \$40,000) toward operating costs for the first year. Space, heating, electricity and maintenance are supplied by the City of Toronto. As well, the City offered the services of the City Auditor for a period of one year to set up a bookkeeping system and to provide monthly financial statements for the Board of Directors. Inclusive of space, it is estimated that users presently receive a subsidy of between \$25 and \$30 a week.¹ A further subsidy of \$20,000 has been approved by City Council for the 1981 fiscal year. This will allow the centre to maintain its present fee structure. Thirteen of the centre's fifty spaces are subsidized jointly by the Province and the City of Toronto.

3. The Unions

The unions, CUPE Local 79 and 43, which represent the majority of civic employees had tentatively agreed to a grant of \$1,500, pending general membership approval. These funds were to be applied against the purchase of equipment. However, the unions did not donate the funds on the following grounds:

1. Members questioned whether it was the role of the unions to pay for day care;
2. Day care at City Hall did not initiate nor was it negotiated for in bargaining by Union Local 79 or 43. It was therefore felt that union members would not have sufficient impact on decisions;
3. Day care workers would not be members of Local 79;

¹City of Toronto Planning and Development Department, "Feasibility of a Day Care Centre Serving City Hall Employees", February 8, 1980.

4. Projected fees were considered to be too high to make the service affordable for lower income employees. The initial number of five to ten subsidized spaces were considered to be too few.

This decision by union members constitutes an unfortunate lack of co-operation and lets traditional procedures and self-interest hinder the achievement of a desirable goal for and by employees.

4. The Centre in Operation

The Centre's fifty spaces make it large enough to maintain itself and with subsidies from the City and Metropolitan Toronto, enable the employer to offer workplace day care at reasonable cost (\$60 per week). There are twenty spaces filled from outside the civil service, of which thirteen are subsidized. Cost to parents who are not employees and do not receive subsidies is \$75 per week per child. There are ten spaces available for infants (3 months to 1-1/2 years), ten for toddlers (approximately 1-1/2 to 2-1/2 years), and thirty for preschoolers (between the ages of 2-1/2 and 5 years). The Centre operates at capacity and an average of ten requests per week are received. Among them are usually two or three desperate single parents. There are 150 on the infant care waiting list.

Peter Landry, Director of the Centre, lists among its benefits:

- a better relationship between caregivers, parents and children;
- parents may have close contact with their children;
- the service benefits the middle income parent because of the subsidized fee;
- travelling time is reduced, permitting the employee to be on time for work and there is less pressure to leave on time;
- the Centre's independent status as a nonprofit organization allows employees (i.e. parents) to contribute to policy decisions;
- employees are more relaxed at work and able to focus their energies and be more productive;
- highly trained, skilled labour can remain at work resulting in lower turnover of staff;
- a humanizing effect on the workplace;

and among its problems:

- travelling in rush hour traffic and for long distances;
- attitudinal obstacles with maintenance and cleaning staff which means that Centre staff must work on building relationships;
- the site, not originally designed for children, has some problems and extra safety precautions must be taken.

5. The Business Community in Downtown Toronto

A surprising amount of interest in the Centre has been shown by the business community. Since its opening in September 1980, 22 companies and agencies, including every hospital in Toronto, a bank, two large communications corporations, insurance companies, a large union, two market research companies acting for client companies, and two federal government departments have made enquiries about the operation of the Centre. A number of enquiries have been received from as far away as Calgary and Montreal. In response, a "Workbook on Workplace Day Care" is being prepared by the Centre. It is designed to fill the need for practical information and will give details about the process involved in setting up a workplace day care centre, and spell out issues and strategies.

Hester How Day Care Centre has been heralded "a milestone in the country's movement toward recognition of working parents".¹ There is indeed opportunity for many more such milestones to be set.

Summary

Workplace day care has been slow in becoming established in Canada. Educational institutions involved in the development of early childhood education and hospitals experiencing recruiting problems were among the first employers providing day care. These began with the need to satisfy individual objectives - day care centres for research and teaching purposes or as a recruiting tool for hospitals - but have evolved as a social service fulfilling an expressed need. Unionized employees, such as CUPE Local 1000 Ontario Hydro, and Communications Workers Local 50 Bell Canada, have made public their desire for workplace and work-related day care provisions. The labour movement is in the process of broadening its views from an initial

emphasis on publicly provided day care to including workplace and work-related day care in the bargaining process. Canadian corporate employers have been reluctant to become involved but are subtly keeping abreast of developments and are showing increasing interest in work-related day care. In times of high unemployment, it is unlikely that they will become involved for reasons of recruitment. It has already been shown that financial incentives or corporate self-interest are not always the sole motivators. Prime motivations found in five developmental models of workplace day care in the United States show that the interest and commitment of an individual senior executive and a commitment to community interests are of major importance. To recall: the company-community model sees corporations as an integral part of the community in a give-and-take relationship; industry-community partnerships work co-operatively in raising private funds for community day care; and individual initiatives have brought about child development and research demonstration projects such as the KLH Child Development Centre in Cambridge, Mass., the North Side Child Development Centre in Minnesota, and in Toronto, Hester How Day Care Centre. The Bureau's survey showed that companies would likely become involved for reasons of good corporate citizenship and good employee relations.

Cost consciousness, however, seems a large factor and benefits to the company deriving from the improved performance of the employee on the job are more directly related to the interests of a company. They encompass reduced absenteeism and turnover, a recruiting tool, greater concentration of the employee on the job and greater productivity, increased esteem for the company by the employee and in the eyes of the community. The opportunity to work and child-related and educational benefits fall into the broader sphere of benefits to society and the economy at large. These benefits are measurable only over the long run in reduced welfare expenses, vandalism and crime rates. It follows that shared benefits should entail shared costs.

¹See: Toronto Star, "City Hall day care Canadian milestone", January 30, 1981.

V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Workplace day care provides parents not only with another option in the range of facilities of quality care, but increases availability in a system which inadequately covers present and projected needs. It can provide an integrated service for working parents which is not present in existing day care facilities.

Given the present Provincial policy of promoting a diverse system for day care delivery, the Bureau concludes that universal day care is not a realistic expectation for the foreseeable future. Incentives, such as \$1.3 million by the Province of Ontario to promote workplace day care unfortunately constitute meager encouragement in this direction. In the meantime, economic necessity is frequently responsible for driving increasing numbers of women into the labour force, and the need to care for children of working parents is immediate.

The U. S. experience with work-related day care provides models for resource pooling within business and industry and for union-management co-operation which have not yet been explored in Canada. Another is the cafeteria style benefit package, permitting employers to offer a more flexible program of employee benefits.

Experience with workplace day care, however, has shown that it is an expensive undertaking. In the 1960's, U. S. companies who became involved in providing workplace day care often bore all expenses associated with the start-up of a facility. In Canada, financial contributions toward start-up costs of any nonprofit day care centre are now eligible for government funding. Expenses to the employer are tax deductible. Operating costs which are also high are usually shared between users, providers and government subsidies for parents in need.

Concrete benefits can accrue to employers who undertake workplace day care, however. Employers who have difficulty recruiting staff or experience high turnover rates have found that the direct benefits of workplace day care offset their financial commitments. They also documented improved company morale and a positive public image. Government sponsored day care centres for employees have shown improved attendance, greater concentration and

motivation of employees. Government is also concerned with and affected by social and educational benefits of day care.

Workplace day care therefore is a viable and important alternative which should be considered. Action should be taken by the Province, municipalities, businesses and labour unions in this direction.

The Bureau therefore recommends that the Province of Ontario:

- strengthen its policy of fiscal incentives for workplace day care by increasing funds for start-ups by employer-employee boards;
- press for federal legislation to make all day care benefits to employees tax exempt;
- add impetus to the policy of promoting workplace day care by establishing a referral service to business and industry to assist in planning and implementing workplace day care;
- work with business and industry to develop a model on-site day care facility to demonstrate the potential of workplace day care;
- set an example by providing workplace day care at Queen's Park and in areas of concentrations of civil servants in Ontario, and give compensations in the form of day care vouchers to employees in other field offices and assistance in locating day care.

Responsibility for initiating action has been placed on municipalities, and they must do more to encourage and motivate various sectors of the community to provide day care. In order to involve the business community, the Bureau recommends that municipalities:

- approach boards of trade and chambers of commerce and establish joint working groups on workplace day care involving business, government, educational institutions, and the day care community;
- disseminate information on workplace and work-related day care and on existing public and private nonprofit centres and agencies and how the business community can assist them;
- facilitate the process for establishing day care centres by examining and possibly streamlining approval mechanisms by working out a better system in co-operation with the Province.

Employer involvement in day care has been sparse and cautious in Canada. Hospitals most frequently are among existing providers of workplace day care

and have experienced workplace day care as an effective recruiting tool. The corporate sector's concern with direct benefits must be broadened to include social goals for the benefit of employees and the community. The majority of the business community, including those who rely heavily on female labour, is passive, but keeping attuned to developments in workplace and work-related day care.

Employers must assess their capacity for providing some form of work-related day care and then commit themselves to it. Toronto's Hester How Day Care Centre at City Hall testifies to the fact that sensitive management is crucial to accomplishing the goal of workplace day care. It also demonstrates the necessity of involving the employees and potential users in the process in order to make it their goal, and shows that an employer subsidized day care centre can be affordable. Long range commitment is essential if a program is to succeed. An employer must look realistically at the range of alternatives from on-site facilities to referral services and decide which are possible.

Once the commitment is made, the essential next step is to determine the views and preferences of all employees. Questionnaires must convey a positive attitude by the employer. An initial questionnaire should ask the following:

- 1) employee interest in those day care options which the employer would be willing to consider;
- 2) specific reasons, if not interested;
- 3) possibility of future interest;
- 4) the number of preschool aged children and their ages;
- 5) present child care arrangements and costs.

A follow-up questionnaire should confirm plans to go ahead or outline the alternatives.

On-site day care is obviously the largest commitment and one which requires certain site conditions, financial commitments, etc. Smaller companies which could not support a 35 to 50 child facility should consider getting together with other employers in the vicinity to jointly assess employee needs. The Hester How Centre will produce a manual on the specifics of establishing an on-site facility which will outline necessary conditions, government requirements, etc.

On-site day care may be planned and implemented by the company exclusively for use by employees. Costs to the employer are tax deductible. Another way it may be implemented is by an employer-employee board, seeking provincial status as a nonprofit entity. The latter has several advantages. It makes the centre eligible for provincial/federal start-up grants and subsidized spaces to parents who qualify for assistance. Priority of use may be given to employees, but the centre must not exclude use by others in the community. It also enjoys independent status and includes employees in decision-making. Corporate financial input is a tax deductible donation. In summary, the Bureau recommends that employers:

- assess their commitment to workplace day care and determine what options they would consider;
- assess need by means of employee surveys, either individually or jointly with other companies, and assure adequate response;
- distribute questionnaires to all employees;
- contact existing day care centres, the Provincial Department of Community and Social Services and the municipality for information and assistance in planning;
- take advantage of the provincial assistance program for startup funding offered to employer-employee boards;
- press the Province for increased funding for employer-employee boards;
- charge fees on a sliding scale to make the service affordable to all;
- work with other companies in devising funding schemes for workplace day care (for start-up costs and centre care costs see pages 34 and 36 and Appendix II);
- include subsidized spaces in a nonprofit day care centre.

On-site day care usually requires a number of months of operation until the centre operates at capacity. For example, Riverdale Hospital opened its day care centre with three children and had an enrollment of 35 within six months. Hester How's facility opened with half its capacity and reached capacity within eight months. It now has an infant waiting list of 150. Initially low enrollment cannot therefore be interpreted as low demand.

If it proves to be impossible to implement workplace day care because of site restrictions (these are governed by the Ontario Day Nurseries Act), lack of space, or funding difficulties, there are a number of alternatives for employers to consider. The Bureau recommends that employers:

- take the initiative to utilize alternate space, for example in schools near the workplace;
- financially assist the efforts of school boards or individual schools in the community to establish day care and obtain adequate spaces for employees;
- provide financial assistance to existing day care centres and/or home care programs and obtain adequate spaces for employees;
- donate administrative expertise (e.g. bookkeeping, maintenance) or services (food from the company cafeteria, utilities, transportation).

A final option is financial assistance to employees to help defray the high cost of good quality care and sensitivity to family needs. Although this option does nothing to create additional spaces, it nevertheless recognizes the necessity of day care for working parents. The Bureau recommends that employers:

- include monthly child care allowances in employee benefit packages;
- adopt the flexibility of cafeteria-style employee benefit packages with day care as an option;
- assist the employee in locating day care by providing a counselling and referral service;
- provide vouchers toward the purchase of child care services;
- provide additional allowances for day care in cases involving overtime or shift work;
- adopt flexible working hours to allow for time requirements of employees with children in day care;
- make allowances for time off for employees to care for sick children.

Some of the above recommendations may be adopted simultaneously with the on-site day care option since they are not mutually exclusive.

Because employers have been reluctant to become involved in day care, it is incumbent upon the employees and the labour movement to press employers for workplace day care. Initial indications within the labour movement are that workplace day care will become a bargaining issue for unions that are composed of a higher percentage of women. However, room also exists for co-operative participation with management to provide day care for employees. Unions may want to re-examine their confrontation policy on this particular issue. Precedents exist for union initiated day care centres in British

Columbia (B. C. Government Employees' Union) and in the United States (Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America). If Ontario unions are determined and committed to increasing the availability of day care, then they should take an active role in it. The Bureau recommends that unions:

- take the initiative in establishing work-related day care;
- survey their membership to assess need and assure adequate response to the question of direct union involvement of work-related day care;
- undertake funding campaigns to establish work-related day care.

Steps toward implementation would follow the same recommendations that are addressed to employers for on-site day care or alternate sites. Another option for unions would be to work in co-operation with employers, and the Bureau recommends that unions:

- approach employers to propose jointly funded workplace day care;
- co-operate in any move by management to establish workplace or work-related day care;
- seek various assistance from employers for union initiated day care (administrative expertise, services and goods).

The third option, to which there already have been indications of commitment, is to lobby the employer for workplace day care. Workplace and work-related day care has relevance for all employees, particularly as the number of single parent families increase and men and women share in the child raising function. The Bureau recommends that unions:

- include workplace and work-related day care in their bargaining goals;
- bargain for child and family-related benefits such as day care allowances, paid maternity leave, retention of seniority and benefits after maternity leave, flexible working hours, leave to care for a sick child, day care allowances involving shift work and overtime.

Resistance to innovation most frequently stems from attitudinal constraints. These often pervade all sectors of the community and all social strata. When fixed attitudes can be overcome or a leading individual makes a commitment to an idea, success may usually be assured. Provision of workplace and work-related day care is outside the control of the individual employee. It is more than a bargaining item for which unions must fight. It is a social goal which requires the co-operative efforts of employers, employees and unions, as well as the education sector and the day care lobby.

APPENDIX A

CHILD CARE AT CITY HALL

There is a possibility that child care services at City Hall could be made available for people who work in the building. You can help us figure out how many children might use City Hall daycare by filling out the form below.

We are asking people who are interested in using a City Hall child care service to list their names and phone numbers. This is so that they can be contacted, if and when we get to the planning stages, and can take part in the operating decisions which will have to be made. There are several ways in which day care services could be provided, and we feel parents would want to be involved in making this choice.

Please deposit this form in the box which is provided on each floor of City Hall near the elevators.

- 1. Do you work for: [] Metro [] City
2. Are you a member of: [] CUPE [] COTAPSA
3. Do you have children between 0-5 years? [] Yes If so, how many? ___ [] No
4. Would you be interested in using a day care centre within City Hall? [] Yes [] No
5. Weekly cost of your present child-care (so we can estimate reasonable fee levels for City Hall day care) \$_____ per child
6. Name and phone number (so we can contact you for planning purposes) Name _____ Phone: _____
7. If you have children of day care age, but are not interested in using City Hall day care, would you take the time to explain why; your reasons may help us to provide a more responsive service. Thank you!

If you have any questions or comments, you can call

ABOUT CITY HALL DAY CARE: It now seems likely - though it is not yet absolutely certain - that we will have a day care centre in City Hall soon. The following form serves two purposes:

- 1. It will tell us how many children the centre will serve, and their ages.
2. It will help us to decide how fees should be set.

If you want your child to attend the City Hall Day Care Centre, please fill out the form and return it to: as soon as possible.

FOR PERMANENT AND LONG-TERM TEMPORARY STAFF

PROPOSED CITY HALL DAY CARE CENTRE PRELIMINARY INFORMATION/APPLICATION FORM

Name _____ Address _____

Name of Spouse _____ Address of Spouse _____

Employer: CITY/METRO/OTHER (SPECIFY) _____

Work Location: _____

Work Phone : _____ Union Affiliation _____

Total Gross Household Income: Please Circle Your Range

- \$10,000 - 15,000
\$15,000 - 20,000
\$20,000 - 25,000
\$25,000 - 30,000
over \$30,000

What are you now paying - or would you be willing to pay - for child care? \$_____ week

Total Number of Children in family _____

Number of Children now needing Day Care: Ages 0 - 2 years _____ 2 - 5 years _____

Number of Children who will need Day Care at a later date _____ (Please specify date, and ages).

Does a child have any disabilities? (Please specify) _____

Signature: _____ Date _____

PLEASE NOTE: some provincially subsidized spaces will be available

ABOUT CITY HALL DAY CARE

Funding has now been approved for a day care centre for permanent and long term temporary municipal employees. Information given on this form will help in organizing the centre. It will tell us how many children will seek places, and how old they are; and it will help us to decide how fees should be set. IF YOU WANT YOUR CHILD TO ATTEND THE CITY HALL DAY CARE CENTRE, please complete this form and return it to: as soon as possible.

PROPOSED CITY HALL DAY CARE CENTRE
PRELIMINARY INFORMATION/APPLICATION FORM

Name _____ Address _____

Name of Spouse _____ Address of Spouse _____

Employer: CITY METRO Other (specify) _____

Work Location: _____

Work Phone No. _____ Union Affiliation: _____

Total Gross Household Income: (Please check your range)
\$10,000 - 15,000 \$20,000 - 25,000 over \$30,000
\$15,000 - 20,000 \$25,000 - 30,000

Total number of children in family: _____

Number of children now needing day care: Ages 0 - 2 yrs. _____
2 - 5 yrs. _____

Number of children who will need day care at a later date: _____
(Please specify date and age) _____

Does your child have any disabilities? (Please specify) _____

Would you be able to pay per week: \$45 - 50 \$55 - 60 need subsidy
\$50 - 55 \$60 - 65 some subsidized spaces will be available

Signature _____ Date _____

APPENDIX B

City of Toronto Executive Committee

February 8, 1980

Appendix C

City Hall Day Care Centre
Operation Budget Estimates June 1 - December 31, 1980

20 children under 18 months (6 staff) \$50,715
30 children 18 months to 5 years (4 staff) 7,385
8 staff at \$10,867 annually; period of 7 months 8,442
1 assistant supervisor at \$12,657 annually (7 months) \$66,542
1 supervisor at \$14,470 annually (7 months)

Benefits @ 11% 7,320
\$73,862

Casual @ 10% 7,386

Total Salaries \$81,248

Equipment replacement @ \$5/month/child 1,750
Food @ \$1.50/child/day 11,000
Insurance 180
General Supplies 70
Laundry 350
Sanitation 420
Health Supplies 25
Office Supplies 525
Phone (1 business line + 1 extension) 210

\$14,530

Operating expenses (estimated) for the 7-month period \$95,778

Equipment Purchases: cupboards 550
beds (30) 450
blocks, hollow blocks 300
tables (10) 500
chairs (40) 400
sand & waterplay equipment 200
cribs donated
high chairs (8) 250
housekeeping equipment 300
office equipment 300
miscellaneous indoor equipment 1,000
outdoor equipment 2,500

\$6,750

© Bureau of Municipal Research

September 1981

Mary Lynch, Executive Director

Ute Wright, Research Associate

CORPORATE

Algoma Central Railway
BP Canada Ltd.
Bank of Montreal
Bank of Nova Scotia
Bell Canada
Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto
Brascan Limited
British American Bank Note Co. Limited
Cadillac Fairview Corporation Limited
Canada Packers Limited
Canada Permanent Trust Company
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce
Canadian Reinsurance Company
Canadian Tire Corporation, Limited
Carling O'Keefe Limited
Confederation Life Insurance Company
Consumers' Gas Company
Consumers Glass Co. Limited
Crown Life Insurance Co.
Dominion of Canada General Insurance Co.
Donlee Manufacturing Industries Limited
Eastern Construction Co. Ltd.
Federal Pioneer Limited
Group R
Guaranty Trust Company of Canada
Guardian Insurance Company of Canada
Gulf Canada Ltd.
The Imperial Life Assurance Co. of Canada
Imperial Oil Limited
The Independent Order of Foresters
Kodak Canada Inc.
Labatts Ontario Breweries
A.E. LePage Limited
Lever Brothers Ltd.

London Life Insurance Company
Maclean-Hunter Limited
Manufacturers Life Insurance Company
Marathon Realty Company Limited
The McLean Foundation
Midland Doherty Limited
Misener Properties
The Molson Companies Limited
The National Life Assurance Company of Canada
Nestlé Enterprises Ltd.
Noranda Mines Limited
North American Life Assurance Company
Northern and Central Gas Corporation Limited
Northern Telecom Canada Limited
Olympia & York Developments Limited
The Oshawa Group
Parking Authority of Toronto
Rio Algom Limited
The Royal Bank of Canada
Shaw Pipe Industries Limited
The Sheraton Centre
Southam Inc.
Stelco Inc.
Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada
Sunoco Inc.
Texaco Canada Inc.
3M Canada Limited
Toronto Star Limited
The Toronto-Dominion Bank
TransCanada Pipelines Limited
Union Gas Limited
Hiram Walker-Gooderham and Worts Limited
George Weston Limited
Xerox Canada Inc.

PROFESSIONAL

H.H. Angus & Associates Ltd.
Ernest Annau, Architect
Armstrong and Molesworth
John Bousfield Associates
Costa, Thurley, McCalden & Palmer
Currie Coopers & Lybrand Limited
Davis & Henderson Limited
F.H. Deacon Hodgson Inc.
DeLCan
Development Engineering (London) Limited
M.M. Dillon Limited
Eric Hardy Consulting Limited

IBI Group
Jarrett, Gould and Elliot
Judicial Valuation
Marshall Macklin and Monaghan
Russell J. Morrison
Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt
Price Waterhouse and Co.
The Proctor and Redfern Group Ltd.
Resources Management Consultants Ltd.
Smith, Auld & Associates Ltd.
Tanfield Enterprises Ltd.
Thorne Stevenson & Kellogg
Weir & Foulds

GOVERNMENTAL

City of Burlington
Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation
City of Chatham
Regional Municipality of Durham
Borough of Etobicoke
City of Gloucester
City of Hamilton
Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth
City of Kingston
Metropolitan Separate School Board
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto
Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs
City of Mississauga
City of Nepean

Regional Municipality of Niagara
City of North York
City of Oshawa
City of Ottawa
Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton
Regional Municipality of Peel
Town of Richmond Hill
City of St. Catharines
City of Sarnia
County of Simcoe
City of Sudbury
City of Toronto
Town of Vaughan
Borough of York
Regional Municipality of York

LABOUR

Ontario Federation of Labour
Sudbury and District Labour Council

200 Personal/Academic Memberships
including Libraries

SC 3
E7
Bv2
file 7

Founded in 1914 as a non-profit research agency, the Bureau of Municipal Research undertakes a wide range of studies into the problems facing municipalities in Ontario.

An advocate of responsive and responsible government, the Bureau has gained wide recognition for the high calibre of its *Civic Affairs*, its *BMR Comment/Topic*, its information and the participation of its staff in the public discussion of issues.

The Bureau is an independent agency supported by a broad cross-section of business and professional firms, organizations, governments, and individuals.

Recent Publications Include:

Civic Affairs

- Directory of Governments in Metropolitan Toronto 1981 - 82, *June 1981*
- The Benefits and Costs of Recreation, *April 1981*
- Providing Municipal Services — Methods, Costs and Trade-Offs, *February 1981*
- School Closures:
 - Are They the Solution? *November 1980*
- Questions for Electors, *October 1980*
- Cost Saving Innovations in Canadian Local Government:
 - A More in-Depth Look, *June 1980*
 - Cost Saving Innovations in Canadian Local Government *September 1979*
- Directory of Governments in Metropolitan Toronto, *1979/1980, March 1979*
- Teaching Local Government: A Responsibility of the Educational System, *May 1978*
- Should the Island be an Airport?, *November 1977*
- Food for the Cities, *June 1977*
- Directory of Governments of Metropolitan Toronto, *1977/78, May 1977*
- Be it Ever So Humble: The Need for Rental Housing in the City of Toronto, *March 1977*
- Legislative Attempts to Control Urban Growth in Canada, *November 1976*
- The News Media and Local Government, *August 1976*
- Pet Control in Urban Ontario: The Municipal Role, *May 1976*
- *Fire Protection Services in Metro: Is Unification the Answer?, *November 1975*
- Metro Toronto Under Review: What are the Issues?, *June 1975*
- Directory of Governments in Metropolitan Toronto 1975/76, *June 1975*
- Citizen Participation in Metro Toronto Climate: for Cooperation?, *January 1975*
- The Development of New Communities in Ontario, *September 1974*
- *Property Taxation and Land Development, *No. 2, 1973*
- *Land Banking: Investment in the Future, *No. 1, 1973*
- *The Toronto Region's Privately Developed New Communities, *No. 2, 1972*
- *Reorganizing Local Government: A Brief Look at Four Provinces, *No. 1, 1972*
- Landlord-Tenant Relationships: Time for Another Look, *Autumn 1971*
- *Urban Open Space: Parks, People and Planning, *Summer 1971*

*Out of print but available in the Bureau's Library.

Topics

- 13 Municipal Services: Who Should Pay?, *February 1980*
- 12 Productivity and Quality of Working Life — Two Sides of the Same Coin, *November 1979*
- 11 Understanding Metro's Transit Problems *July 1979*
- 10 Proceedings Governmental Research Association Conference, *June 1979*
- *9 The Public Interest and the Right to Know, *March 1979*
- 8 Transportation Planning in London: Can London Catch the Bus?, *December 1978*
- 7 Should the Province Help Save Ontario's Downtowns?, *November 1978*
- 6 Questions for Electors, *October 1978*
- 5 What Can Municipalities do About Energy? *March 1978*
- 4 The Public Library as Community Information Centre: the Case of the London Urban Resource Centre, *January 1978*
- 3 Changing the Planning Act: Risks and Responsibilities, *November 1977*
- 2 In Response to the Robarts Report, *October 1977*
- 1 School Vandalism: An Emerging Concern, *September 1977*

BMR Comment

- 166 Design for Development: Where Are You? *March 1977*
- 165 Disappearing Farmland: So What?, *March 1977*
- 164 Is Metroplan A Gamble Worth Taking? *February 1977*
- 163 Restraint Without Hardship: How Do We Know? *November 1976*
- 162 Questions for Electors, 1976, *October 1976*
- 161 The Federation of Canadian Municipalities: In Search of Credibility, *October 1976*
- 160 Is Policing the Public's Business? *July 1976*
- 159 The Role of the Municipal Auditor, *July 1976*
- 158 The News Media and the Metro Toronto Teacher's Strike, *April 1976*
- 157 Low Voter Turnout in Municipal Elections— No Easy Solutions, *February 1976*
- 156 Country Schools: The Effects of the County School Takeover on One Ontario Township, *December 1975*
- 155 The Teaching of Local Government in Our Schools, *October 1975*
- 154 Report on Leisure Time Patterns of Apartment Dwellers in the City of London, *July 1975*
- 153 Metro Toronto Under Review: What Are The Issues? *March 1975*
- 152 Should the Metro Toronto Chairman be Directly Elected? *January 1975*
- 151 The Politics of Waste Management, *January 1975*

your inquiries are invited:



BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

73 Richmond St. West #404, Toronto, Canada M5H 2A1
Telephone (Area Code 416) 363-9265