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“My intent was to remain objective, and just present the facts. Therefore, there is little interpretation of what these changes mean to family well-being, quality of life, or standard of living. I also tried not to focus too much on the causes of the demographic changes. I leave that journey to those who choose to read this document. This document employs a structural approach to defining families, providing facts to ‘describe’ the way families look in 2006. I also assume that families are the basic democratic unit in society who fulfil the following key functions, regardless of what they look like (the functional approach of defining family): (a) love, nurture and morale; (b) physical maintenance and care of family members; (c) household maintenance and support; (d) social control and teaching of positive values; (e) addition of new family members and their relinquishment when mature; (f) socialization of children for their adult roles; and, (g) production (work and labour) and consumption. I think we all appreciate the beyond these broad trends, there is a beautiful diversity between families, contributing to the essence of the amazing Canadian family.”

Sue L.T. McGregor
sue.mcgregor@msvu.ca

Family Structure

In 2006, there were 33,098,932 Canadians. Their median age is 39 years. The life expectancy rate is 80 years of age (77 for men, and 84 for women). As a very general statement, there were 8.7 million families in Canada in 2005. There is an average of 3 people in each family (compared to 4.5 people, 100 years ago). In 2001, 25% of young children in Canada were only children (no brothers or sisters), meaning 75% did have siblings, but fewer of them. Most families comprised: (a) married couples (with kids at home, with kids away from home, or childless) (70%), followed by (b) common-law couples (with kids at home or with kids away from home, or childless) (14%), and then (c) lone parents (16%). In 2004, almost half of the Canadian population was married (including common-law) (49%), with another 42% single and never married, leaving about 6% divorced, and 5% widowed.

1 The 2006 Census data will be released in the Summer of 2007. General Social Survey data is also used in this report (the most recent being 2004), as was the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth, and labour statistics.
More Private Households, But Fewer People in Them

In 2001, there were 29.5 million private households, where 98% of Canadians lived. The other 2% lived in institutions. One percent of Canada's population are long-term residents of health care institutions. Others live in penal institutions (13,000 Canadians), and such. Of those Canadians living in private households, 87% were in a family (married, common law and lone parents), 10% lived alone, and 3% lived with relatives or non-relatives/others.

On average, 2.6 people lived in each household, down from 2.9 in 1981 (nearly an 11% decline). Smaller households are now the norm, and this pattern is emerging because of people's decisions to live alone, necessitating more private dwellings, and because of smaller families. Households consisting of four people or more accounted for 25% of all households in 2001, down from 33% two decades earlier.

Homeless

Homelessness is a situation in which a person does not have a long term residence, a stable residence, or any residence at all. While more and more Canadian individuals and families encounter circumstances that render them homeless, to date, there is no reliable method for counting the number of people who are homeless. Hence, Canada does not have any accurate national statistics. According to the 2001 census, on any given summer day, there are 14,000 Canadians staying in a shelter, with numbers much higher in inclement and winter weather. This figure is up from 10,762 in 1987, the first year the homeless were ‘counted’ in Canada. The 2001 census numbers reflect .05% of the population. In Toronto alone, admissions to homeless shelters increased by 75% between 1988 and 1998.

However, using shelters as a way to count the homeless is flawed, because soup kitchens and shelters are seldom frequented by some subgroups of the homeless, including young people. The Canadian National Homelessness Initiative estimated that there are 150,000 homeless Canadians (.5% of the population). A seminal 1987 report noted there were 250,000 homeless, and said this was a conservative estimate. It is very difficult to determine the...
number of homeless people in Canada, even to define what is meant by homelessness. There is no good count for Canada.

People may be living temporarily with friends, relatives or strangers, possibly in unsafe, inadequate or tenuous housing (relative homelessness), or be living in the streets permanently (absolute homelessness). The latter are referred to as rootlessness, wherein people live and sleep outdoors or in structures not meant for human habitation. Using another approach, people can be temporarily, cyclically or chronically homeless, depending on changes in life circumstances.

The composition of the homeless population has changed from being "derelict" older men to predominantly young men, with teenagers, women and children becoming more prominent. At least 80 per cent of them are able-bodied people who do not abuse alcohol or drugs or have serious mental problems. The seminal Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD) 1987 report (considered reflective of current times) noted that 45 per cent of the 250,000 homeless Canadians were actually employed, underscoring the fact that not all the homeless are without resources, but that many live in conditions of poverty and underemployment; 50 per cent were receiving financial social assistance of some kind; 33 per cent fit into the category of alcohol abusers; 20 per cent were former psychiatric patients; 15 per cent could be classed as drug abusers and 3 per cent were physically handicapped. Almost 10 per cent had been evicted from where they lived.

**Childlessness**

Two thirds of Canadian families have children. But, there is a trend towards childless families. Between 1981-2001, there was a 10% decline in the number of married couples having children. It is difficult to gauge the actual incidence of childlessness in Canada (voluntary or not) because people at Statistics Canada meld this data into "married with no children at home". They assume that the empty nest stage equates to “no children”. In 2001, 41% of married and common-law couples were “without children,” a statistic mainly attributed to the empty nest stage (the kids had left home to live on their own).

A small proportion of married couples choose to remain childless. They opt not to enter the phase of parenthood. There were 7,059,835 couples in Canada, in 2001 (includes married and common-law). The general consensus is that between 15- 20% of Canadian couples decide to be childfree (the preferred word to childless, taken to mean something missing). At the beginning of the 20th century, the childfree rate was 15%. It shrunk to 7% when the baby boomers had their children, and has since increased to between 15-20%, depending on which research is consulted.

Right now, in Canada, 14% of older people are childless. They ended their reproductive lives without children. Roughly 37% of those aged 30-34 are currently childless. Close to three quarters (73%) of individuals aged 20-34 do not intend to have children (while only 25% held this position 20 years ago). Single Canadians, aged 20-34, are nearly twice as likely to not want children as are Canadians in this age group who are married.

Scholars agree that current research on voluntary childlessness is imperfect. There is evidence that women who are early deciders (early articulators) make the decision not to have children before they turn 30, before they are married, and then express strong, unwavering commitment to this decision. Those who are uncertain about their intention to have children tend to finally make the decision (yes or no) after they have entered into a couple relationship. Before this final decision, they vacillate, articulate ambivalence, and express uncertainty.

There are some women who do not have children because ‘they did not get around to it.”
Scholars call this *unintentional childlessness*, brought about by career choices, couple enhancement, marrying late, failed marriages, and not wanting to raise a child alone (waiting for a partner). Only 13% of these people were alright with not having children. The other 87% held deep regrets that their childbearing years passed them by, or “got away from them” over time. This is an instance of “unwanted childlessness,” characterized by ‘creeping non-choice.” These women always intended to have children.

Some people remain childfree because of religious reasons; they choose to follow a spiritual path that requires them to be childfree. There are even people who are “environmentally childfree” because they choose to forego having children for the good of the planet, or because there is too much violence, hate and disorder.

Couples can also be childless due to infertility, rather than by choice. After trying to have a child for a year without success, couples are said to be infertile. This does not mean they are unable to have children, but that their ability to conceive is being hindered by a medical disorder. One in every 15 Canadian couples (7%) experience fertility problems, due to sexually transmitted diseases, pelvic inflammatory disease, delayed childbearing, or male infertility. One in 10 couples never find out the cause.

**Smaller Families**

While the majority of Canadians will experience being a parent at some time in their life, the size of Canadian families is declining. Women have, on average, 1.5 children during their childbearing years, compared to 3.5 children in the 1920s. This represents a 133% decrease in birth rate. This rate is so low that not enough people are being born to replace the number of Canadians dying. The replacement rate for industrialized countries is 2.1 children, with the 2 referring to the children needed to replace the parents when they die, and the 1/10th (the .1) to make up for children who die before the age of 15 (when fertility rate is calculated). Canada is far below the 2.1 replacement rate, sitting at 1.5, and falling. This means fewer children are being born, translating into smaller families, namely because of childless couples, one-child couples, single parents, starting families later, and lone homeowners (never marrying).

**Marriages, But Fewer of Them, and Lower Expectations to Be Married**

Canada's marriage rate has fallen quite steadily since the early 1970s. Of all of the *couples* in Canada in 2001 (7 mil), about 85% were in a legal marriage (the other 15% were in common-law couple relationships). But, the number of marriages in Canada has been declining in recent years, with a drop of 6% recorded between 1999 and 2004 (in only 5 years). In 2004, there were 146,377 marriages in Canada. This compares to 159,959 ten years earlier (a 9% decrease). Only 51% of women and 48% of men ever expect to be married by the age of 50. This reality compares to 65% expecting to be married at age 50 in 1981. This change represents a 30% decrease in the expectation to be married. Furthermore, in 2001, 42% of women aged 20-29, and 35% of men in the same age bracket, were not in any formal union, married or common-law. This is down from 60% and 45%, respectively, from 1981, representing, in general, a 25% less chance of being in any kind of formal relationship.

**Marrying Later**

An attendant trend is, indeed, to marry later. Whereas men and women

---

7% of Canadian couples experience fertility problems - they want children

6% drop in number of marriages; 30% decrease in expectation to ever marry

Don’t marry until mid 30s
tended to get married between the ages of 26 and 29 about 25 years ago, they now wait until they are aged 32-34. People are marrying much later in life, almost six years later than in 1981. Women especially are waiting longer before they marry for the first time, shifting from age 26 to 32, compared to men who shifted from 29 to 34. For the past 35 years, there has been a consistent gap of around two years between the ages of men and women for the first time they get married.

Women have postponed marriage to extend their education, and advance their career. Overtime, they have come to place less value on marriage as means of structuring their relationships, and have become less dependent on marriage to augment their well-being. They seem to have moved from marriage as an institution to coupleship as a form of companionship. Research shows that men delay marrying because they want to avoid possible relationship failures, and all attendant problems.

**Starting Families Later**

In the past, young married couples had full families by the time they hit 30. These days, many couples are nearing 40 before they even start to have children, if at all. By the mid-90s, the proportion of Canadian women over 40 giving birth to their first child passed the proportion of women aged 15-19. In 1999, women waited until they were 27 to have their first child (compared to 25 in 1980, and 22 in the mid-60s). In 2003, 48% of mothers were age 30 and older when they gave birth, and 52% under. Two decades ago, three-quarters of moms in Canada were under 30.

**Common-law Couples**

To live common-law simply means to live together without being legally married. Couples living common-law represented 14% of all family forms in 2001, up from just 6% in 1981. This shift in family form represents a 133% increase in couples deciding to live together without being married. There is one common-law couple for every eight married couples.

The number of common-law couples with children under the age of 25 is also increasing, currently at 7%, up from 2% ten years ago. Put another way, 13% of all kids in Canada lived in common-law families, four times more than 20 years ago (3%). Some provinces and territories have much higher common-law rates than the national average: Nunavut (31%), the Northwest Territories (26%), and Quebec (25%).

Cohabitation is now viewed as a prelude to or substitute for a first legal marriage, as well a remarriage. The former viewpoint is held by the younger generation. The younger women are, the more likely they are to opt for common-law as their first union. More than 40% of women, ranging in age from 30-39, are expected to choose common-law as their first union (rather than a marriage). In contrast, 68% of women aged 40-49, and 86% of women aged 50-59, will chose marriage as their first union. Younger women embrace common-law unions earlier in their lives as a first union. Older women are more likely to experience common-law unions after a previous marriage. Only 59% of women ever go on to marry their common-law partner (a figure much lower in Quebec (33%) where common-law unions have been accepted longer).

As well, common-law unions are less stable than marriages. They are twice as likely to end (66%), as is a first marriage (33%). Although the likelihood of separating from the common-
law relationship varies with age, a third of women (33%) will leave one common law union, and 10% will leave more than two unions. Those women aged 30-49 stand a 40% of having the relationship end, compared to 25% for women older than 50. As well, the younger the woman, the higher the likelihood of entering into a second, and third common-law union (25% in general). Finally, women who leave a common-law relationship are four times more likely to enter another one, instead of marrying.

**Single, Lone Parents**

Trends in divorce, as well as an increase in births outside of a conjugal relationship, have contributed to the growth in the number of lone-parent families. Twenty five percent (25%) of Canadian families with children (1.4 million families) were headed by a lone parent in 2002, up from 16% a year earlier, and up from 6% in 1981 (a 76% increase over 20 years). This compares to 6 million married couples and 1.2 million common-law couples (including same sex couples). Of all of the lone families, about one third comprised those who have divorced, 25% were separated (still legally married), one fifth were widowed, and 20% had never been married. As of 2001, the large majority were headed by women (81%), and 19% by men. Lone parent families were slightly larger (1.5 children) than two parent families (1.1 children).

In 2004, over two thirds (68%) of female lone parents were employed (up from 50% in 1976), compared to 72% of women in two parent families, and 58% of all women in Canada. Single women parents were more likely to be working, than attached women parents. In general terms, almost three quarters of Canadian mothers with children under 16 at home were employed either full or part time, in 2003. Two thirds of women lone parents earned an income above the Statistics Canada Low Income Cut Off poverty line, up from 50% 25 years ago. Male single parents were more likely than women to be above the poverty line (87%). In 2001, there were 4.1 million fathers in Canada, 6% of them as single Dads, 82% married, and 12% in a common-law relationship.

**Divorce**

The divorce rate has risen dramatically in Canada since the late 1960s, largely as a result of legislation in 1968 easing divorce restrictions. Close to 40% of all marriages end in divorce in Canada. There were 70,828 divorces in 2003. While 50% of Canadians expect to be married at least once by the time they reach 50, the same percentage also expect to be divorced. The crucial year seems to be year four of the marriage, with 25% of couples divorcing after the fourth wedding anniversary (compared to 5% after the 1st anniversary). In 2000, 60% of couples who divorced had been married less than 15 years. Also, 38% of Canadians can expect their marriage to end in divorce before their 30th wedding anniversary (meaning that two thirds continue on together). By the age of 60, divorce is relatively rare in Canada. Once they do divorce, 83% of women move into the paid labour force. In 2001, 69% of ever married people were still with their first spouse, and they had been married an average of 23 years. But for one quarter, their marriage ended after 11 years.

**Divorced Kids**
Custody of children. In the past four decades, the percentage of young children whose parents have separated has increased three fold. About 23% experienced parental separation before their 6th birthday, compared to 8% in the 1960s. However, most children continue to live in two parent families (80%), including blended (6%) or step families (10%). Children can either be awarded to the mother, the father, or jointly. In 1997, the mother received sole custody 67% of the time, fathers 11%, with joint custody being awarded 28% of the time. This pattern changed profoundly about ten years later. For the first time, in 2002, fewer than half of kids were given into the care of their mother (49%) (a 26% decrease). Dads received custody 8.5% of the time, a 22% decrease. Now, joint custody are the new pattern, shifting from 28% in 1997 to 42% in 2002 (a 33% increase). In 1998, if kids lived with their Mom, they were more inclined to have contact with their Dad (46%), than not to (irregularly or never saw their Dad, 40%). Also, three quarters were still in touch with their Dad five years later.

Remarriage After Divorce
In 1997, 24% of brides and grooms had been married before, compared to 10% in the 1960s. By the 21st century, this number had increased to 43%. Three quarters of divorced people remarry, or re-couple. Nearly half actually remarry (43%) instead of entering into a common-law arrangement. They averaged 39 years of age at the time of the second wedding. Half of them married someone who had also been married before (55%), and more than one third had lived common-law before marrying (37%). In 2001, these second marriages had lasted at least 13 years for 71% of the couples, and were still ongoing. Only 20% left their second spouse, and did so after 7.6 years of the second marriage. To an even a smaller extent, less than 1% of the ever-married population had been married three times or more (137,500 adults), entering the third marriage at age 46. Close to forty percent (38%) had lived with their spouse before marrying again. These multiple marriages lasted even shorter than the former ones, averaging only four years. Indeed, remarriage is quite common, but less so than before because of the increasing tendency to cohabit.

Step Families
Step families emerge when one of the partners in a relationship has a child or children from a previous relationship. When the couple as a child(ren) of their own, they are called blended families. In 2001, there were 503,100 step families in Canada, up 17% from 1995. Twelve percent (12%) of two parent families were step families. Almost half (40%) of Canadian step families were blended families. The total number of step/blended families was equally split between married and common-law couples.
Most step families form after the birth of child to the couple (81%), at which point they become a blended family. If this trend continues, there is a possibility that there could be more step families and blended families than original families (also called intact families, currently at 88%). Remember that common-law and marriage arrangements end more often than ever before, creating this situation.

Children born into step families will experience separation again from their parents at a rate double that of intact families (43%). Furthermore, 10% of those children will live in two or more additional reconstituted families. Children will have to learn to manoeuver new relationships with half-brothers and sisters, as well as multiple new adults.

**Same-Sex Couples**

For the first time, in 2001, Statistics Canada asked Canadians about same-sex partnerships (under the rubric of common-law couples). The data counted 34,200 same sex pairs, representing 0.5% of all couples, or 1 in every 200 couples (there were 1,158,410 common-law couples in Canada in 2001). The majority of same-sex families (81%) live in one of the 27 bigger, urban centers. They do not tend to live in rural areas of Canada. But if they do, it is more likely to be female couples (25%). There are slightly more male same-sex partnerships (55%) than female (45%). Also, about 15% of female same-sex couples have children living with them, meaning the vast majority are childfree (85%). Only 10% of male same-sex couples have children living with them (meaning that 90% live with no children in the relationship).

**Single Occupant Households**

More people than ever before are living alone. There were 29,522,305 people living in 11,562,980 privates households in Canada, in 2001. That is a ratio of about 2.5 in each house. One quarter of these houses (25% of 11.5 million households) is occupied by one person, up from 20% in 1981, a modest 20% increase. One major reason is the growing number of seniors, namely women, who are living alone. Of course, from another perspective, this means that 75% of households are home to more than one person. But, at the same time that more people are living by themselves, the number of four person households is decreasing (at 25%, down from 33% in 1981).

**An Aging Society**

Any country with more than eight percent (8%) of its population over 65 is considered to be an old country. Canadian society is old. In 2006, 13% of the Canadian population was over 65 (1.8 mil men and 2.6 mil women). Almost three quarters (69%) of Canadians were aged 15-64, and 18% were aged 0-14. These numbers will change dramatically in the next few years as the 10 million Baby Boomers age, bringing the percentage of people in Canada over the age of 65 to 20% for 2030, up from
the current 13% (a 35% increase). By 2015, there will be more people over the age of 65 than under the age of 15, an unprecedented situation in Canada. This trend is emerging because of the convergence of the aging Baby Boomers with the reality that women are delaying child birth, having only one child, or remaining childless (voluntarily or not).

**Widowhood**

With an aging society comes widowhood, defined as a state wherein one spouse has died, and the remaining spouse has not remarried. Five percent (5%) of the Canadian population lived in the state of widowhood in 2001 (1.5 million people aged 15 and older). Eighty percent (80%, 1.2 mil) were aged 65 and over, leaving 300,000 (20%) younger than 65. Women make up more than 80% of this group, a figure that will increase as people age. Remember that men have a much higher mortality rate at advanced ages. The life span for women is 84, and it is 77 for men.

Indeed, widowhood is not reserved for elders, but most widows and widowers are over the age of 65, 1.2 million, a 6.4% increase from 1996. In 2003, 82% of Canadians aged 65 and older living in widowhood were women, outnumbering men five to one. Women who lost their husbands between the ages of 65 and 74 were three times more likely to live by themselves than women who lost their husbands before the woman was 65. As well, widowed people tended to live alone (72%), up from 39% of widowed persons living alone 30 years ago, in 1971 (a 45% increase).

Also, 20% of lone parents live in widowhood (rather than being divorced, separated or not married). They likely comprise the bulk of the 300,000 younger widows/widowers in Canada. I could not find Census statistical or demographic information about people who are widowed young (between the ages of 20 and 50). Spouses may die from terminal illness, accidents, childbirth, war, or suicide.

**Multigenerational Households - Sandwich and Club-Sandwich Generations**

A multigenerational household contains a combination of people born into different age cohorts. Families containing more than one generation (also called the extended family) do exist in Canada, with some sources claiming they are on the increase. A 2003 Canadian study reported that it is now more common to find three generations in one household, than before. On the other hand, Statistics Canada noted that, in 2001, very few families bridged three generations, only 2% of all households. The 2001 General Social Survey puts the figure at 4% of Canadians living in multi-generational households (about 930,000). This percentage is almost double for immigrant households (7%).

The incidence of so few multigenerational households in general can be explained. Remember that almost half of the Canadian population is single and never married (42%), and that 26% of Canadians live alone in a dwelling. What is key is that the generation-bridge appears in a particular form of family, one with both adults working while caring for themselves, children, and other adults.

Three quarters (73%) of all Canadian families, with adults working and also caring for elders, had children under 20 at home -
three generations in the home. Most older Canadians over 65 have children (82%). They are living long enough now to experience grandparenthood, with 75% of them having grandchildren. The multigenerational household appears when these grandparents move into their children’s home.

Canada has long experienced the sandwich generation (working couples caring for children and elder parents or in-laws, relatives, even neighbors), affecting 30% of people aged 45-65 (7.3 million Canadians), or 25% of the entire population. Eighty percent (80%) of them work full time. There is a new moniker for people who are caring for themselves, their parents, their children and their own grandchildren - three or more layers of responsibilities. They are called the club-sandwich generation because a club sandwich is a triple-decker sandwich. In Canada, half of all grandparents (there are 5.7 million grandparents in Canada), shared a home with their adult child, his or her spouse, and the grandchildren. These 50-something adult children are looking after their own parents while guaranteeing their children’s mortgages and providing free baby-sitting services for their grandchildren. They are the slice in the middle of the triple-decker sandwich. They are taking on obligations to the generation above them, and the next two layers following. Also, those in their 30s and 40s with young children, aging parents and grandparents are also part of the club sandwiches.

Of all grandparents, one third (33%) shared a home with their single parent daughter who had a child due to a teen pregnancy. This may explain the new trend of younger grandparents. More than 10% of grandparents who shared a home with their grandchildren and a lone parent (their single Mom daughter) were under the age of 45. Likely, instead of the grandparent moving in with the child, the child moved in with the parent (who is now also a grandparent). Another interesting trend is that one child in every 250 (.4%) lives with his or her grandparent only (rather than with both parents), especially in the Northern Territories. These arrangements are called skip-generations.

### Young Canadians - Children and Youth

Let’s talk about children. There are 10.1 million Canadians under the age of 25 living in Canada, called young Canadians. In 2001, 67% of the Canadian population comprised adults, and 33% were children. Of those, 6% were preschool, 13% were aged 5-14 (elementary), and 14% were youth (aged 15-24). It is very interesting that Statistics Canada considers adults over the majority age of 18 as youth, when youth is usually taken to mean the time of life between childhood, late adolescence and maturity.

What is also interesting is that the percentage of youth in Canada, relative to adults, has fallen markedly in just 20 years. In 1981, almost half of the Canadian population was aged 0-24 (42%), down now to 33%. This is a 21% decrease, reflecting the below replacement fertility rate noted earlier. While three quarters of young Canadians do have brothers or sisters at home, this figure is much lower than the 90% in 1971. Almost half had only one sibling (44%) in 2001, and only 2.5% lived in families with five or more siblings, compared to 25% in 1971.
quarters of youth under 20 live in cities.

In 2001, 13% of kids lived with common-law parents, four times more than two decades ago (3%). Among families with children, the most rapid growth involved children born in common-law unions, with an increase of 172% between 1981-2001. This compares to a 10% decline in the number of married couples having children. Although a large majority of children live with two parents (80%), they are not necessarily their biological parents. Continuing trends are step families and blended families, discussed earlier.

**Youth Staying Home Longer**

Leaving home is a significant event in a person’s life. While most of youth aged 25-29 do leave home (80%), a full 20% (1 in 5) now stay home longer. Parents used to be able to anticipate the creation of the ‘empty nest stage.’ Instead, youth are staying home longer, creating the ‘crowded nest stage.’ Boomers born between 1952-56 (now aged 50-54) had a 59% probability of leaving home by age 21. This is in deep contrast to 42% leaving home for those born between 1972-1976 (currently 30-35 years old). Kids are three times more likely to stay put longer.

In 2001, 41% of young adults aged 20-29 lived with their parents, compared with 39% in 1996, 33% in 1991, and 27% in 1981 (again a three fold increase). The younger set of this age group (aged 20-24) was more likely to still be living at home (58%), especially men (64%), versus women, at 52%.

Those youth living in **intact families** (original, no divorce) are more likely to stay home than those raised in a step family (56% more likely for women, and 30% more likely for men). Also, although, having four or more sibling raises the chances of leaving home earlier, a decline in this means a preponderance of ‘only children’ staying home longer. Midway through the last century, 20% of Canadian children lived with at least five brothers or sisters at home. That figure dropped to just 1% in 1991, an incredible 95% decrease. Most children nowadays have only one brother or sister, or remain an only child. In 2001, families had an average of 1.1 children. Of 5.3 million families with children at home in Canada, 43% had only one child, 39% had two children, and 18% had three or more children.

**Youth Returning Home**

In the past 50 years, the likelihood of men and women returning home after leaving to ‘start an independent life’ has nearly tripled (30% chance in 2001 compared to 10%). One in three Canadians who are 30 years of age now, will return home after leaving. Demographers have even come up with a name for this phenomenon - **kidults**. Reasons for returning include:
break up from a common-law relationship, heavy debts from university education, financial difficulties of another nature, a reduced stigma of living at home, wanting a standard of living their parents enjoy but impossible to attain on their own, and needing parent’s emotional support while trying to gain independence. Studies have consistently shown that youth who leave home to marry or live common-law are far less likely to return home than those who left to attend university, or get their first job. Studies also show that the latter youth stay away for only four to six months before returning home; credit the sluggish labor market.

**Dual Income Couples Now the Norm**

In 2006, 52% of the Canadian population is working. Due to stagnant wages in real terms, family income has remained stagnant. This loss of spending power led many couples to decide that both spouses would have to enter the labour market. In families comprising *couples*, dual incomes are now the norm. In 1976, half of all families had a stay at home parent, compared to 20% in 1997 (a 60% reduction in one parent staying out of the workplace). In 2001, 62% of couples with children under the age of 18 living at home had *both partners* working in the *paid* labour market. Twenty percent of the time, just one of the partners was working. Neither partner working (18%) entailed retired couples, and those families on social assistance, or other sources of government income.

When including family types in addition to couples, in 2001, there was a combination of: both parents working (55%), one parent in a two parent family working (30%), a single parent working (8%), or no one working (10%).

Back to couples again... in 2003, half of couples both worked full time (48%). In slightly more than 1 in 4 households, one worked full time, and one worked part-time (28%). The remaining households saw one person working full time. This profile changed very little when children were entered into the equation. Forty-two percent (42%) of couples with *no kids* both worked full time (23% saw one person working full time), while almost half (49%) of those with kids both worked full time. What is telling is that, since 1976, couples with kids are twice as likely now to have both adults working (49% increase). In 2005, 12 out of every 100 single-earner Canadian families (includes married and lone parent) saw the Dad as the stay-at-home parent. This situation was up from 2 out of 100 families in 1976, an 83% increase.

**Changing Work Arrangements: Rise in Non-standard Employment**

In the memorable past, Canadians expected to work a full-time, 9-5, 40 hour work week with weekends off, and a minimum
15% of Canadians have some level of disability. 70% experience a disability that lasts 3 months or so.

Those times are gone. A new standard has emerged. Part time, temporary and self-employment account for over half of all jobs created since 1991. The use of contract work has risen significantly. Even 10 years ago, 88% of private and public sector organizations reported hiring contract workers.

More people are working fewer hours as part time workers, as casual workers, and more people are working longer hours. In 2004, 70% of all part time workers were women. If they were working full time, they earned 30% less than their male counterparts. More than 70% of Canadians hold a service sector job. Here are some compelling facts reflecting this new standard, drawn from a 2004 Canadian study:

- 1 in 4 earns less than $10.00 an hour (average is $6.60)
- one third of Canadians worked in low paying jobs (earning less than $410.00 per week)
- 30% worked part-time or in temporary jobs, and the number is growing
- 7% are totally employed in temporary jobs (75% increase from 1989)
- 28% of part-time workers would like to be full-time, down from 34% in 1994
- 61% work shift work (especially part time workers)
- 30% do not have a regular day time job
- 25% work evenings or night shifts
- 40% hold rotating or irregular shifts
- 10% work both days in the weekend, 10% Sunday only, and 16% Saturdays only
- 5% hold multiple jobs
- 16% classify themselves as self-employed (70% increase in last 25 years).

Families with Disabilities

Canadian experts view disability through several lenses. A disability can be a disease or medical condition. It can be a restriction in ability to perform certain standard living tasks. It can be seen as a barrier to social activities, preventing people from participating fully in Canadian life. And, it can be a human rights issue, related to human dignity and protection from discrimination and practices that keep people from being admitted, included or even considered in a range of societal, political and economic decisions. A 2001 Canadian government study considered people to had a disability if they had a physical or mental condition or a health problem that restricted their ability to perform activities that are normal for their age in Canadian society.

The most recent statistics (2001) show that 1 out of every 7 Canadians, aged 15 and over, had some level of disability (14.6% (3.4 million) of the population). This is about par with world standards (10-20%). This data did not include the Territories. The chance of being disabled in Canada was highest for those aged 65 and over (41%). Ten percent of those aged 15-64 had a disability.

The type of disability can vary. But, the most commonly reported are: mobility (72%), pain (70%) and agility (67%), followed by hearing (30%), sight (17%), and others. Disability does not just refer to permanent conditions, defined as those that leave someone confined to a wheel chair, or unable to perform major life activities, for a long period of time.
Such activities include caring for oneself, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning, and performing manual tasks. About 70% of Canadian adults over the age of 35 suffer a less permanent disability that lasts three months or longer (usually due to pain).

Visible Minorities (Canadian Diversity)

In 2001, more than 200 ethnic origins were reported in the Canadian Census. When Canada celebrates its 150th birthday in 2017, ten years from now, one in five people will be a visible minority (compared to 1 in 8 right now). The visible minority population is projected to increase from 56-111%, while the rest of the population will grow by only 1-7%. The trend is already in place. Between 1996 and 2001, the total population increased 4%, while the visible minority population rose 25%, six times faster. In 2001, 13.4% of the population identified itself as part of the visible minority population (nearly 4 million people). This is a marked increase from just 20 years ago, when only 5% of Canadians self-identified as visible minorities (a 65% increase).

For clarification, the term visible minority refers to persons who are not of the majority race in a given population. In Canada, that happens to be the Caucasian race. So, Statistics Canada refers to any person who is non-Caucasian in race or non-white in color, other than Aboriginals, as visible minorities. In the context of social inclusion, the term is used in a positive way, and will be done so in this discussion. Others may be uncomfortable with this euphemism, as am I. Regardless of the label, it is evident that Canada’s family life is becoming very diverse, ethnically, culturally, linguistically, religiously.

Not all visible minorities are foreign born. Two thirds are born outside of Canada, and one third are born in Canada. This ratio is expected to change dramatically by 2017, with only 25% of Canadians projected to be immigrants born abroad, down from 65%. Countries of origin are also changing. In 2001, 52% of immigrants came from Asia, 21% from Europe (almost half of them from Eastern Europe), 8% from Central and South America (including the Caribbean Islands), 7% from Africa, and 5% or less from the United States. This is a marked change in the source of immigrants present during the formative years of Canada, from European immigrants, leading to the Caucasian race majority, to namely Asian now. All four race colors are represented in Canada: white, red, yellow and black.

Most of all new immigrants settle in just five cities (Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, Edmonton and Calgary (95%)). The fastest growing religions are Islam, Hinduism, Sikhism, and Buddhism, with Christianity still the forerunner (72%), but losing ground. The mother tongue is slowly shifting away from English and French, currently spoken by 83% of Canadians. Chinese is the most common emergent language. Three quarters of children and youth immigrants cannot speak French or English when they arrive in Canada, a trend that is increasing.
There is an increase in intermarriage as well, leading to a new generation of Canadians reporting multiple ethnic ancestries. In 2001, there were 217,500 mixed unions (marriages and common-law unions) involving a visible minority person with a non-visible minority person, or a person from a different visible minority group. This was an increase of 30% from 1991, compared with an increase of 10% for all couples. In 2001, these mixed unions represented 3.1% of all unions in Canada.

**Aboriginal Peoples**

This discussion will end with a profile of the First Nations people of Canada, our beginnings. In 2001, just over 1.3 million people self-identified as part of the Aboriginal population: North American Indian (First Nations) (65%), Métis (30%), and Inuit (5%). There are also Innu peoples in Canada; but, for some reason, their presence is not reflected in Statistics Canada’s profile of Aboriginal peoples. Innu means human-being in their language. As of 2003, the Innu numbered 18,000, and lived in Eastern Labrador and Quebec (83%). They call their land Nitassinan. They were formerly known as Montagnais or Naskapi Indians. The Innu are based in 12 communities.

Aboriginal peoples recorded in the Census have a presence in all provinces, but their largest presence is in the three Prairie provinces (45%) followed by Ontario (20%), British Columbia (17%), Quebec (8%), the Northern Territories (5%), and Atlantic Canada (5%). Half of Canada’s Aboriginal peoples lived in urban areas (49%), a third lived on reserves (31%), and the rest lived in rural non-reserve areas, often in isolated Northern communities.

There are over 50 different languages spoken by Native peoples, and all are in decline. Only 24% could carry on a conversation in their mother tongue in 2001. The most common are Ojibwe, Cree, Inuktitut, and Mi’kmaq. The Inuit and Innu were most likely to speak their own language.

The Aboriginal peoples of Canada are a young nation compared to Canada as a whole. The latter averaged 38 years old, while Aboriginal peoples averaged 24 years of age, in 2001. One third of Aboriginal peoples were under the age of 15. Elders comprised only 2.5% of the Aboriginal population (compared to 13% of the general Canadian population).

Regarding Aboriginal children and youth (comprising 50% of the population, compared to 33% in the general population)... whether they lived in a two parent or lone family depended on if they lived on reserve or in the city. Those living in the city tended to live in lone parents (48%), while those on reserve tended to live with two parents (65%). In the general Canadian population, 25% of children lived in single parent homes. Also, the Aboriginal
birth rate is about 1.5 times higher than the general population. In fact, while the birth rate of the general Canadian population declined by 1.3% in 2001, that of Aboriginal peoples rose by 25%. The largest population gain occurred among the Métis, where the number of Métis under 25 grew by 31%. By 2017, the size of the Aboriginal population is projected to grow by almost 20%, with the largest increase among those aged 15-24. As well, the current generation of youth will mature to adulthood (enter the age group of 20-29) at a growth rate four times faster than the same age group in the general population.

People are now more inclined to move back to reserves than to leave them, although right now, the majority live off reserve (61%). Those likely to move to the reserve are those living in rural, non-reserve communities.

Conclusion

This document shared a snapshot of the major trends affecting the changing nature of Canadian families. Twenty seven different dimensions of the diversity of family life were addressed. Within the context of an aging society, Canadian families are getting smaller, forming later, and shifting format over time (step, blended, lone, et cetera). More and more families are multigenerational in nature, reflecting kids staying home longer, and elders moving in. There are more widows, more people living alone, more people living on the street. Conversely, people are deciding never to get married, and if they do, they delay having children, have fewer of them, or none at all. More people are more likely to opt for common-law relationships rather than legal marriages. Children in Canada are more likely to experience two parents (with one parent on the increase), only one sibling, step families, more divorce, joint custody, more stay-at-home Dads, and eventually living with a grandparent. Young adults (aged 20-29) do not leave home as early, return home more often, delay getting married, marry much older than earlier generations, and decide to stay single, often living alone.

Dual income couples are definitely the norm, not a trend, and the nature of where they are working to earn their income is changing profoundly. More families live with disabilities than before, and more often it is a three month or longer, temporary situation. There is no doubt that the visible face of Canadians is changing from white Caucasian to more yellow, black and red races. Furthermore, the changing ethnic mix of Canada brings new cultures, religions and languages. Aboriginal peoples, who have inhabited this land for thousands of years, are experiencing their own demographic shifts within the Canadian context (increased birth rate, younger, more urban).

To state the obvious cliché -
Canadian families are changing.
It is an amazing and powerful transformation.