

Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc. (CPRN)

600 – 250 Albert Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 6M1

Tel: (613) 567-7500 Fax: (613) 567-7640

Web Site: <http://www.cprn.org>

**Final Report:
Child Care Policy Conference**

**Senate Chambers, University of Ottawa
Friday, October 18, 2002**

This lively, informative and well attended one-day conference was jointly organized by Rianne Mahon of the Institute of Political Economy, Carleton University and the Family Network of Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN). Participants came from across Canada and included students and professors; policy researchers; federal, provincial and municipal government officials; and child care advocates and providers.

The day was divided into two sessions. In the morning, presentations focused on national child care policies in Europe and Japan. The afternoon session considered North American child care policies, with presentations on Canada, Quebec, Manitoba, and the United States. The complete agenda, which also lists the organizations that contributed funds to the event, is included in Appendix A. Throughout the day there was ample time for discussion. Numerous participants expressed their appreciation of the meeting.

This report consists of two main sections and appendices. Section 1 provides a brief overview of the major themes that emerged from the presentations, while Section 2 contains abstracts of each of the presentations.

1. Overview of Major Themes

Four major themes or ideas emerged from the presentations throughout the day:

- Child care policy serves a variety of goals;
- Child care is particularly important *now*;
- Different “models” exist; and
- Advocacy and organization count.

Theme 1: Child Care Policy Serves a Variety of Goals

One theme that emerged very clearly from all the presentations is that child care policies can be designed to serve a variety of goals. Child care, in other words, rarely has only a single policy purpose.

The presentations suggested that child care policy is often designed to seek *one or more* of the following objectives:

- To enable higher rates of female labour force participation, which can be especially important in situations where there are labour shortages;
- To support the transition of parents, especially those heading lone-parent families, into the labour force;
- To provide early childhood education and support good child outcomes;
- To promote gender equality, by enabling women to reconcile work and family life and to foster a more egalitarian family division of labour; and
- To encourage higher fertility rates.

Given this wide variety of goals, it is important to examine each case carefully to uncover the motivations of policy-makers.

Theme 2: Child Care is Particularly Important Now

Although child care serves a variety of policy goals, the presentations highlighted the growing importance of certain policy goals related to the knowledge-based economy and social policy redesign. These are listed here:

- There is a mounting demand for higher rates of female labour force participation in the countries profiled. This comes from two major factors: the post-industrial service economy and the need in countries that depend on social insurance arrangements in their welfare regimes to increase the number of contributors. The latter factor is particularly important in several European countries. Therefore, the assumption that child care will be provided at home is no longer valid.
- There is an ageing population in each of the countries profiled, due to increased longevity, the post-1945 baby boom moving toward retirement, and declining fertility rates. The evidence suggests that families limit the number of children where access to child care is least well-developed. Southern Europe is the classic example here.
- Scientific studies of brain development, as well as knowledge about child development, provides new social knowledge about the importance of early stimulation and quality care for all children, but especially for those who may be “at-risk” because of social disadvantage.

Theme 3: Different “Models” Exist

The presentations identified three basic models that have been developed to address the wide range of possible policy goals or to respond to the different policy challenges that exist in specific locations. These models can be summarized as follows.

The *egalitarian model* is most often found in welfare regimes with a clear commitment to class and gender equality, and where the state – rather than the family or the market – is the main provider of welfare. Today, the egalitarian model of child care policy is most often found in places where a commitment to state welfare has been recently reconfirmed.

According to Rianne Mahon, an egalitarian blueprint for child care usually includes:

- Paid parental leaves close to wage replacement levels (75 to 80 percent);
- Parental leaves that include strong inducements for both parents to share the leave, that is, “daddy months” or employment of the “use it or lose it” principle;
- Universally accessible and affordable child care;
- Access to early childhood education services;
- A skilled and adequately paid work force within the child care sector; and
- A community voice about child care provision.

Presenters indicated that a *neo-familialist model* of welfare provision is also gaining popularity in some countries. A familialistic welfare regime is a welfare state that continues to subscribe to and sustain the traditional obligations of family welfare. According to Ito Peng, this kind of welfare regime tends to have the following features:

- Strong commitment to the idea of the male breadwinner and female housewife household structure, including high levels of marriage and a low incidence of both divorce and single parenthood.
- The state relies on the family to look after the welfare needs of its members, and, therefore, there is a low level of social welfare and social service provision by the state and an underdeveloped private care market.
- There is a strong emphasis on social insurance as the way to give access to welfare rights. This is partly because social welfare is considered a family responsibility and partly because there is a strong commitment to protecting the full-time male wage earner. One result is labour markets that exhibit high levels of rigidity and little flexibility.
- High levels of intergenerational co-residency and welfare obligation.

Child care services are hard to find in these situations. The presentations described Italy, along with Japan, as an example of a familialistic model of child care. The presenters also pointed to the existence of *neo-familialist* versions of this model, which may include programs to encourage mothers to withdraw from the labour market for an extended period by paying them an allowance to care for their own children. In France, for example, the *allocation parentale d'éducation* pays an allowance to mothers but does not include a right to return to their job. Finland is also developing policies that reflect the neo-familialist model.

The third model identified in the presentations is the *liberal model*. This model also assigns responsibility for care to the family but, in cases where families need child care, policies encourage parents to look to the market for services. Public support, if it exists, is provided in the form of tax credits or other indirect benefits. Services provided by the market are not always regulated by the state. A market in informal, unregulated services frequently exists alongside a market for regulated services. Liberal welfare regimes also tend to provide publicly financed services only to those deemed “in need,” by providing subsidies to poor or lone-parents. As Sonya Michel reported, in the United States this has meant coupling child care subsidies to work requirements that were introduced as part of recent welfare reforms. It is also interesting to note, as Rianne Mahon does, that liberal welfare reforms have proven most susceptible to what she calls “Third Way” policy approaches that focus on “investing in children.”

A clear message that emerged from the discussion of models is that very few places have implemented a single model in its “pure” form. For example, in the case of France, Kimberly Morgan argued that all three models can be found in different programs. Egalitarian principles underpin access to preschool provided by the Ministry of Education, liberal principles motivate the tax credits and supports for hiring a babysitter, while familialism informs the French policy of parental allowances.

Theme 4: Advocacy and Organization Count

The final theme that ran through several presentations was the importance of advocacy and mobilization for securing or improving child care policy designs. One key factor was the commitment of political parties and social movements to particular principles, whether equality or familialism, which produce a limited menu of choices about how to provide child care. Also important were the mobilization of women’s groups, child care advocates and coalitions, family movements, trade unions, and so on. The commercial sector was also an important actor in some cases. Finally, a number of presentations stressed the importance of government officials for promoting child care policy and for making links to other policy realms such as employment.

Depending on the balance of political forces and the presence (or absence) of some actors, the presentations suggested that the design of child care would respond to a different combination of objectives and models. These actors could help to push both discourse and policy toward universal child care or towards other solutions, such as informal care, family care, and so on.

2. Presentation Abstracts

Morning Session: Child Care Policy in Europe and Japan

Child Care: Toward What Kind of “Social Europe”? – Rianne Mahon, Institute of Political Economy, Carleton University. Email: rianne_mahon@carleton.ca

Child care policies in the European Union need to be considered in relation to a broader set of changes affecting all OECD countries. The “defamilialization” of care, resulting from changes in labour markets and families, is generating what some have called a “care deficit”; it is not possible to count on families caring for their children at home. Yet, it is also the case that few families can afford to rely exclusively on markets to meet these needs. Governments are thus being pressed to assume greater responsibility for care provision. The result is that states face choices about how best to address these needs, with these choices holding implications for equality in general and gender equality in particular.

There is no one way to respond to these challenges. Indeed, three rival models exist, driven by domestic political forces and choices. There is a “Third Way” design that is inspiring child care policy reforms in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. France and Finland are taking a “neo-familialist” route. The Danish and Swedish policies reflect a continuing commitment to egalitarian principles. Each of these has different implications for equality.

In the era of “globalization,” however, policy choices are not shaped by domestic politics alone. While national politics still matters, the struggle to build a “Social Europe” is opening Member States of the European Union (EU) to new and different ideas for welfare state redesign. Child care initially was brought onto the agenda as part of the EU’s commitment to gender equality in the labour market. Now, however, it forms part of the EU’s employment strategy, which is being pursued using the Open Method of Co-ordination and its techniques originally developed to ensure monetary policy coordination. As yet, none of the competing models has come to define “best practice” for the EU, and we can observe that the contours of “Social Europe” are still under construction.

Gender and Generation: Japanese Child Care Policy and the Demographic Crisis – Ito Peng, Department of Sociology, University of Toronto. E-mail: itopeng@chass.utoronto.ca

Child care policy is an excellent lens through which to examine some of the most interesting processes of welfare state reconfiguration in Japan. This is because child care has been at the centre of important policy debates throughout most of the post-war era and is again salient.

Theoretical Framework. This presentation could only provide a quick overview of the theoretical framework for locating and understanding the Japanese welfare state in relation to other welfare states. In his seminal work on the three worlds of welfare capitalism, Gøsta Esping-Andersen organized welfare regimes into three clusters: social democratic regimes (e.g., Sweden, Denmark, and other Nordic countries), liberal welfare regimes (e.g., the United States, Canada, United Kingdom, and Australia), and conservative regimes (e.g., Germany and France). Like many other welfare states, Japan never fit very well within this typology.

In recent years, increasing numbers of people (and including Esping-Andersen) have, therefore, begun to use the idea of the familialistic welfare regime to describe countries such as Japan and some southern European countries such as Italy and Spain.

But, in addition to these features, Japan is also a “developmentalist” welfare state, with a long history of having a strong bureaucratic and highly interventionist state. To this end, many of the social welfare policies, including child care policy, in Japan have been made to serve the country’s nation-building and economic development objectives.

Therefore, paradoxically, while Japan’s familialistic orientation assumes child care to be the family or the women’s responsibility, whenever the country needed women’s labour, it provided public child care in order to achieve its nation-building and economic objectives. This combination resulted in constantly shifting child care policies.

A Quick Overview of Post-War Child Care Policy in Japan. The development of child care policy in Japan in the post-war era can be divided into four periods:

- After World War II to the mid-1950s, when 55 percent of married women were employed and there was support for public child care.
- The mid-1950s to the end of the 1960s, when child care policy began to bifurcate into endorsement of public child care for single mothers (widows) but endorsement of mother-centered child care for a growing number of middle-class families. Married women’s employment declined to 35 percent in 1970.
- The 1970s and the 80s, with an ambivalent child care policy but mounting employment rates for married women.
- The 1990s, with a “fertility crisis” in 1989 – the “1.57 shock” of the plunging fertility rate and challenges to the reliance on the family for tending to family members’ welfare. Child care and family policy began to change. Given the current fertility rate, the total population of Japan will reach a peak at around 2007, and thereafter will decline steadily. By the end of the 21st century the Japanese population is estimated to drop to about half the current level. In summary, the demographic shifts will have serious social and economic, as well as cultural and psychological impacts, on Japan.

Child Care Policy Reforms in the 1990s. Currently about one-quarter of pre-school age children in Japan go to public child care. There is a national-level policy on child care, which is then provided by local governments, most often via service contracts with licensed child care centers run by private, non-profit organizations. Normally, only lone-parent families and families with two working parents qualify for public child care.

But, since the introduction of the *Angel Plan* in 1994, the state has promised to expand public child care to make it available to all parents wanting to use child care. In 1999, the Prime Minister confirmed this promise. In addition the government introduced new employment legislation and family policy measures to help and support women and parents with young children in balancing work and family.

The reality is that there are large regional variations in the actual delivery of public child care. Some cities cannot build child care centers fast enough, while in other parts of the country the fertility decline has resulted in excess spaces.

The Lessons from the Japanese Case

- The Japanese experience makes it clear that gender relations and demographic changes are crucial factors shaping social policy today.
- The political and demographic imperatives faced by the Japanese welfare state in the 1990s is a good illustration of what happens when the family becomes over-burdened by “traditional” care and welfare responsibilities. This is the paradox of the familialistic welfare state.
- The Japanese welfare state’s policy responses to gender and demographic pressures, while clearly significant, have yet to show signs of achievement – that of reversing, or even slowing the decline of the fertility.

Contemporary Politics of Child Care in France: The Complex Political Legacies of Past Policies – Kimberly Morgan, Department of Political Science, George Washington University, and Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Health Policy Scholar, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University. Email: Kimberly.morgan@yale.edu

The early childhood care and education system in France often comes in for international renown. Yet, while preschool education has long been universal and is an important component of the French child care system, provision for children under the age of three has been slower to develop. In contrast to the *écoles maternelles*, which are publicly-run and staffed by well-qualified teachers, care for the 0 to 3s is often provided by less skilled, low-paid workers in informal settings. Moreover, government policy in recent years has been to use care allowances to promote the exit of mothers with young children from the labour force, a reversal of previous policy orientations that aimed to support women in paid employment.

This presentation probes the contemporary politics of child care in France through an implicit comparison with some of the Nordic countries. Sweden and Denmark have universal social programs that generate broad-based constituencies of support. This is consistent with social democratic theory, which advocates universalistic social provision as a way not only to rectify social problems, but to create enduring political resources for left parties. The same can be said for policy interventions to de-familialize care work, which have integrated nearly all women into the sphere of paid employment. High rates of female labour force participation mean that virtually all parents rely on public care services, while also altering women’s perceptions about the acceptability of paid work. The result is strong support for public child care and policies to support mothers in the workforce.

In France, by contrast, the move toward de-familialization of care was truncated by economic slowdown in the 1980s. The preschool system for children aged three and over had become almost universal by the mid-1970s, but publicly funded programs for children under the age of three were just starting to expand when the realities of chronically high unemployment and fiscal strain began to sink in. Policy-makers began seeking less expensive ways to provide social care, including less regulated family day care and payments to mothers in the home. Proportionally, less investment went in municipal *crèches* and more to other forms of child care. New benefits were made available to parents that allowed them to hire a child minder (and not pay the employer's share of benefits) as well as to deduct some of the costs of fees and salaries. Moreover, these benefits are available both for those using family day care and for those simply hiring an untrained and unregulated babysitter to come to their home.

These policy shifts reflect the weakness of the constituency for regulated child care, and continuing divisions over the acceptability of mothers' employment. Without having effected the transformation of society along the lines of the "parent-worker" model of the Nordic states, there is stronger support among the French public for a policy that pays mothers to be home with their children. Moreover, while there are strong unions of teachers backing the public preschools, day care for children below the preschool age lacks an equivalently mobilized workforce that could protect the public system. The current complexity of the French child care system thus reflects the diverse political legacies of earlier policy interventions.

Modernizing the Italian State: The Impact on Child Care – Vincent Della Sala, Department of Political Science, Carleton University. Email: vdsala@ccs.carleton.ca

Italy provides an interesting case study for understanding the politics of child care and of the welfare state. It demonstrates that the process of welfare state restructuring may be carried out using discourses and techniques that offer opportunities for previously excluded groups. While this may make it easier to generate support for change, it does not necessarily mean an enhancing of citizenship rights.

In the case of the care of Italian children, preschool education for children between three and six years old has been part of the public education system for nearly forty years. Services for infants and toddlers, however, were much influenced by Italy subscribing to the familialist approach to welfare. Therefore, in contrast to pre-school, infant and toddler child care remains uneven in its distribution and enjoys varying degrees of commitment from the several levels of government that share responsibility for funding and provision. Block funding means that regional governments may choose to provide – or not – for child care needs, despite a 1971 commitment by the federal government that any child who needed one would have a child care space. In general, levels and type of service provision have been little motivated by any concern for women's equality and citizenship rights.

In recent years, however, the pressures of European integration and globalization have sparked a debate about welfare state reform. In addition, the plummeting fertility rate in Italy has sparked a great deal of concern. Both of these factors mean that there is now, almost for the first time, an extensive debate about measures to facilitate women's labour force participation. This is because of the stresses these low rates have created within the familialist model and the fear that lack of services is leading couples to postpone or refuse to have children. In this context, there has been increasing talk about making improvements in the services available for the care of young children. In other words, other needs – such as to protect the broader system of social protection – and external pressure have trumped the policy preference for familialism in Italy.

Afternoon Session: Child Care Policy in North America

Child Care in Canada: Federal Initiatives Past – Susan Phillips, School of Public Policy and Administration, and Rianne Mahon, Institute of Political Economy, Carleton University.

Email: susan_phillips@carleton.ca; rianne_mahon@carleton.ca

This presentation examines attempts during the post-war period in Canada to establish a national child care strategy. In recent years, this has occurred in the context of the politics of welfare state restructuring. Although the emergence of the time-pressed, dual-earner family has generated a strong need for non-parental child care, this transformation has received, at best, limited support from the state.

For the most part, Canadian governments have assumed that middle- and upper-income families are able to look to the market to meet their needs, and have provided only limited relief in the form of a tax deduction for child care expenses. Child care programming has focused on low-income families, with three different phases.

First, between 1966 and 1996, welfare-based subsidies were also available to those “in need or in danger of becoming in need” under the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP). The CAP system left the initiative to the provinces, however, thereby producing a very uneven development of child care across the country, in terms of coverage as well as form. Beginning in the late 1980s, the federal government undertook two major attempts at establishing a national child care strategy, both of which were abandoned. The politics of fiscal restraint and the elimination of CAP in 1995 marked the culmination of this second period. A third opened with the move toward the Social Union Framework Agreement (SUFA) and the tight policy connection made between reforms to social assistance, “investing in children” and child care.

Throughout, however, Canada is a case characterized by limited support for universal child care. This is not surprising because Canada's child care policy is embedded in a broader liberal welfare regime, and liberal regimes tend to minimize the state's role relative to the responsibilities of families and of markets. One result is that the Canadian state has been open to action to correct for market and family “failures” in child care arrangements but has not promoted a universal system. Commitments to such principles also help to explain why, in spite of two major attempts, a national strategy has never been achieved.

Manitoba's Child Care System: Social Liberalism in Flux? – Susan Prentice, Department of Sociology, University of Manitoba. Email: susan_prentice@umanitoba.ca

Manitoba's child care system is characterized by many of the features that are familiar to liberal regimes, but is also marked by some exceptions that might be characterized as "social liberalism." Among these are a flat fee structure, a small proprietary (commercial) sector and unit funding. All of these build more social solidarity than might be expected in a liberal system, although they are weak on creating "woman-friendly" care.

Child care has emerged as a high profile issue under the NDP government. The province has recently undertaken a public consultation on a new "vision" for child care to which over 24,000 Manitobans have responded. It subsequently launched a Five Year Plan.

The political landscape is shifting, as a new para-public institution – the Child Day Care Regulatory Review Committee, which is known as the Reg Review Committee – has emerged as a new actor in the child care field, taking the lead in child care policy development. The Reg Review Committee joins older networks of child care advocates (the provincial professional association, the Manitoba Child Care Association (MCCA) and the Child Care Coalition of Manitoba.

Differences in the original system plus the shifting political landscape may have begun to lay the groundwork for more far-reaching changes. There are various prospects for change, including the possibility of leveraging municipal involvement. The presentation concluded that, of these possibilities, the most interesting potential route for systemic change is the emerging idea of a bilateral (federal-provincial) initiative that would see Manitoba become a "test case" for child care under the Social Union Framework Agreement. To succeed, this strategy would require an increase in federal funds (because the province has already increased its spending recently), a quick decision, and the continued involvement of the voluntary sector.

"A Second James Bay"?: Quebec's Policies on Parental and Non-Parental Child Care – Jane Jenson, Director, Family Network, Canadian Policy Research Networks and Département de science politique, Université de Montréal. Email: jjenson@cprn.org

Since 1997, Quebec has been rowing against the tide with respect to child care. It has placed its policy on a clear trajectory towards universality and affordable access, at the same time that France, the country that served as a model for Quebec in the past, is moving towards neo-familialism. Sweden has replaced France as the model for Quebec's modern family policy.

Child care has been the centrepiece of Quebec's family policy since 1997. This ambitious reform package not only provides universal access to child care at a rate of \$5 per day (with reduced rates for low-income and half-time guaranteed for those on social assistance), but also kindergarten for 4-year olds in disadvantaged areas, full-day kindergarten for 5-year olds, and after-school child care for \$5 a day, as well as a promise to extend parental leave and make changes to Family Allowances/income security benefits. Thus, while Quebec's family policy is best known for its affordable cost, it has many more dimensions than the provision of child care, and is founded on objectives that are tightly linked to the restructuring of social protection.

Because the reform of family policy in 1997 was multi-dimensional, several lines of conflict have since emerged. In general, these areas of conflict can be grouped in the following four categories:

- *Access* – Initially the demand for places far outstripped supply and created significant tensions; however, a commitment of one billion dollars has now resulted in a rapid increase in the number of spaces, as well as eliminated waiting lists for some age groups.
- *Quality* – The child care system is based on a promise of developmentally appropriate early childhood education, which requires trained staff. Educational institutions have stepped in to offer more programs and unions have gained higher wages for child care workers. Nevertheless, there are still staff shortages.
- *Challenges from intergovernmental relations* – Bill 140, unanimously passed by the National Assembly in 2001, shifts the principles of access to parental leaves from hours-worked to income earned; increases the replacement rate; and institutes inducements for both parents to use the leave. However, Quebec has not yet convinced the federal government to remit the funds the province claims from Employment Insurance, in order to implement these legislated changes to parental leaves.
- *Challenges in a “marketized citizenship regime”* – Providers of commercial child care and some parents have pushed from the beginning for more “choice.” In spring 2002, the government lifted a moratorium (in place since before the reform) on new licenses for profit-making providers. Although they are not eligible for subsidies, for-profit providers can now set up new services.

***There Is More, But It’s Still Less* – Sonya Michel, Department of American Studies and History, University of Maryland. Email: smichel@umd.edu**

Public funding for child care in the United States comes in two forms: tax-based subsidies to families that are middle-class and above, and subsidies to low-income families, mainly through the social assistance program known as Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF), which mandates that a certain proportion of recipients must engage in work outside the home. This presentation examined only the second of these.

Because the funding basis of TANF child care is complex and non-permanent, parents’ access to child care through this program is not secure. Thus, though the federal government has increased funding for child care, demand has also increased and a smaller proportion of those needing services are receiving them than they were under previous programs. Indeed, only 14 percent of those eligible for subsidies under federal criteria are receiving them. State matching funds are also sometimes falling.

Data collected by the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) in Washington, D.C., supports the conclusion that this paradox can be understood by examining four factors:

- The complexities of funding formulas, which include both outright moneys for child care and funds that were either discretionary or dependent upon various political and economic conditions;

- Bureaucratic impediments and local conditions, including practices and regulations that limit access to child care for low-income families;
- Inadequate compensation for providers, and
- A lack of quality and coordination among services.

Further, the federal government has devolved much of the decision-making and criteria-setting to the state level. Based on a five-state survey (Illinois, Washington, Maine, Iowa, and Texas) conducted by CLASP, there is evidence that both state-level political will and federal funding are critical determinants of availability and quality of child care. A comparison of the five states reveal that four – Illinois, Iowa, Washington, and Maine – have demonstrated commitment to providing child care for as many low-income families as possible, although recent budget crises have made it more difficult to do so. Only one state, Maine, adheres to all federal guidelines for eligibility; the others all fall short. Texas, however, engages in “double-devolution,” decentralizing decision-making and funding to counties and municipalities, a practice that produces wide inequalities in child care cross the state.

Two points can be made by way of conclusion. One is that the pressures for services will only increase if requirements for labour force participation (more hours) are included in the current and on-going renewal of TANF. The second is that, because of the tight linkage now made between publicly provided child care and social assistance in the thinking of most citizens, as well as that of decision-makers, prospects for public universal child care in the United States are dim.

Appendix A. Conference Agenda

Wanted: A Child Care Policy for Canadians

October 18, 2002

Senate Chambers, Room 082 (Basement Level)

Tabaret Hall, University of Ottawa, 550 Cumberland, Ottawa

09:30 **Words of Welcome :** Feridun Hamdullahpur, VP Research, Carleton University
Opening Remarks : Jane Jenson, Director, Family Network, CPRN, and Université de Montréal

10:00 - 12:30 **Child Care Policy in Europe and Japan**

Chair: Caroline Andrew, Dean of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa

“Child Care: Toward What Kind of Social Europe?” – Rianne Mahon, Carleton University and CPRN

“Gender and Generation: Japanese Child Care Policy and the Demographic Crisis” – Ito Peng, University of Toronto

“Contemporary Politics of Child Care in France” – Kimberly Morgan, Yale University and George Washington University

“Modernizing the Italian State: The Impact on Child Care” – Vincent Della Sala, Carleton University

12:30 **Lunch**

13:30 - 16:00 **Child Care Policy in North America**

Chair: Kathryn McDade, Children's Policy, Strategic Policy Branch, Department of Human Resources and Development, Canada

“Child Care in Canada: Federal Initiatives Past” – Susan Phillips, Carleton University

“Manitoba’s Child Care System: Social Liberalism and Flux?” – Susan Prentice, University of Manitoba

“A ‘Second James Bay’? Quebec’s Policy on Parental and Non-Parental Child Care” – Jane Jenson, CPRN and Université de Montréal

“There *Is* More, But It’s *Still* Less” – Sonya Michel, University of Maryland

16:00 **Closing Remarks :** Rianne Mahon

Co-sponsored by the Family Network of Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN) and Carleton University (Department of Political Science, Institute of Political Economy, School of Public Policy and Administration, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and Women’s Studies).

We are also grateful for the assistance provided by the Deans of Public Affairs and Management and Arts and Social Science, Carleton University, the Vice-President Research, Carleton University, the Dean of Social Science, University of Ottawa, Human Resources Development Canada, and Routledge.