

further, almost 24% of children from families whose incomes were greater than \$50,000 also received free sitter care. Higher-income families were more likely to pay rates at the upper end of the cost scale. The average out-of-pocket expenditure, per hour per child, was \$1.27 for those children whose mothers paid for sitter care.¹¹⁴

As noted earlier, the Survey found that in 1988 there were about 202,000 children cared for in day care centres, representing just over 7.5% of the total number of children in care in that year. The vast majority of such children were very young. The Survey concluded that the average hourly payment per child, for those parents being charged, was \$1.59.¹¹⁵ In 1988, 6% of children in day care cost their families more than \$100 per week, while 5% cost their families nothing at all, largely due to subsidization. Day care payments for about 50% of the remaining 89% of children were between \$1 and \$50 per week, and between \$51 and \$100 per week for the other 50%. As mentioned, subsidization is a key factor in limiting day care expenditures. Day care for 21% of children is subsidized, to some extent, by the government, with subsidization largely restricted to lower income families. It was found that, in 1988, 31% of children from families in the \$1 to \$50,000 family income range received subsidies, with 49% of those from families with family income of no more than \$30,000 having some financial assistance; these figures were felt to be slightly underestimated.¹¹⁶

Finally, the Survey found that about 47% of children in day care were in privately-run centres in 1988, with a further 24% in facilities operated by community or day care agencies. In that year, more than 13% of children were in municipal government-sponsored programs and 11% participated in school- or church- operated facilities. Lower-income families made relatively greater use of centres operated by municipal governments or by a community or day care agency, rather than a privately-run centre.¹¹⁷

Finally, the Sub-Committee notes that child care costs are related to the age of the child. Care for children under 3 years is relatively high-cost and labour-intensive, and may cost up to 33% more than the cost for an older child.¹¹⁸

The Sub-Committee is convinced that adequate, affordable and accessible child care is an important measure in the prevention and alleviation of child poverty. Ensuring that families have access to flexible, affordable, high-quality child care would permit both parents in a two-parent family to engage in the labour market work that may be necessary to ensure both an income above the relevant low-income cut-off and the labour force needed to safeguard Canada's competitiveness.

Given the Sub-Committee's view of the importance of child care as a poverty prevention measure and the urgent need expressed by many witnesses for a national child care system that is flexible, accessible, affordable and of a high quality, the Sub-Committee recommends that, as funds are identified:

A2 the Federal Government remove the 5% limit on the growth of Canada Assistance Plan funding for child care in those provinces not receiving fiscal equalization payments.

¹¹⁴ Susan Crampton, p. 71, and Mary Anne Burke, *et. al.*, p. 14.

¹¹⁵ Susan Crampton, p. 73.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

¹¹⁸ Mary Anne Burke *et al.*, p. 13.