



# Legal Age for Leaving Children Unsupervised Across Canada

---

Mónica Ruiz-Casares & Deniz Kilinc  
January, 2021

This updated study reviewed Canadian (a) statutory norms and jurisprudence to determine age at which children can be left unsupervised and (b) safety, child self-care and babysitting programs. Only three provinces establish a minimum age (12 or 16 years) at which children can be left alone or in charge of other children. Quebec is the only province with an age limit for leaving children unsupervised in a vehicle (seven years). Age is only one of the child factors generally considered by the courts in assessing adequate care and supervision. Canadian social services organizations advise that children under 12 years should not be left at home alone. Policy and advocacy efforts should provide accurate information and support to caregivers and children. This information sheet is an update of the 2015 information sheet with the same title (Ruiz-Casares & Radic, 2015).

## Introduction

Parents and caregivers often have to make difficult decisions to ensure children’s safety and support while coordinating school-work schedules and facilitating children’s growing independence. In reality, many children regularly spend time home alone unsupervised. As children mature, increasing autonomy may help them “engender responsibility and self-reliance” (Flynn & Rodman, 1989, p. 668). However, lack of supervision has been linked to a number of negative outcomes such as unintentional injuries and death in young children (Ablewhite et al., 2015); Petrass, Blitvich, & Finch 2009; Petrass, Blitvich, & Finch 2011; van Beelen et al., 2013; Panzino et al., 2013) and self-harm in adolescents (Richardson et al., 1989; Ruiz-Casares et al., 2012). For parents, the consequences of leaving children without adequate care or supervision may also include legal responsibility. Indeed, in the USA and in Canada, lack of supervision is the most common type of substantiated child neglect (Hélie, Collin-Vézina, Turcotte, Trocmé, & Girouard, 2017; Ruiz-Casares, Trocmé, & Fallon 2012; Hussey, Chang, & Kotch, 2006).

Child welfare jurisdictions across the 13 Canadian provinces and territories define supervisory neglect in terms of caregiver behaviors that result in harm or place children at risk of harm (i.e., no observable harm needed to bring legal charges against caregivers) (Ruiz-Casares, Trocmé, & Fallon, 2012). Inadequate parental supervision may encompass behaviors and circumstances that include not watching a child closely enough, using inadequate substitute child care, failing to protect a child from a third party, or allowing a child to engage in a harmful activity (Coohey, 2003, 2008). In this study, we focus on the use of inadequate substitute childcare and particularly leaving a child alone or under the supervision of another child in a vehicle or at home. While other

factors such as child’s maturity and context are essential when determining adequate supervision (DePanfilis, 2006), clarifying legal minimum ages below which children shall be presumed not to have the capacity to care for themselves or other children would help guide caregivers and professionals.

## Findings

### Legal age limits for leaving children alone at home or in a vehicle in Canada

Parents are required to adequately provide for the supervision of their children at all times as they are ultimately responsible for their children’s safety. As indicated in Table 1, the definition of “child” under welfare Acts is linked to the age of majority in seven provinces and territories. One territory defines child as a person under 18 where the age of majority is 19. The remaining five provinces and territories define child as either being or appearing to be under the age of 16.

The majority of provinces and territories do not limit the age at which a child can be left alone in their statutory rules. However, in two provinces (Manitoba and New Brunswick), the welfare Acts state that a parent cannot leave a child under the age of 12 unattended without making provision for adequate supervision. In Ontario, the statutory limit is 16 years. When it comes to leaving a child unattended in a vehicle, only Quebec establishes a statutory age limit (seven years).

**Table 1: Legal Framework for Child Supervision at Home or in a Vehicle in Canada (2020)**

| Province/<br>Territory       | Legal<br>age of<br>majority | “Child”<br>(Welfare<br>Act) | Child<br>home<br>alone<br>(years) | Child<br>alone<br>in<br>vehicle<br>(years) | Situations  | Penalties       |                               |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------|-------------------------------|
|                              |                             |                             |                                   |  |   | Fine<br>(CAD)   | Imprison<br>ment<br>(months)  |
| Alberta                      | 18                          | 18                          | –                                 | –  | Abandonment/loss<br>Inability/unwillingness to<br>supervise                                 | ≤<br>25,000     | ≤ 12                          |
| British<br>Columbia          | 19                          | 19                          | –                                 | –  | Abandonment<br>Inability/unwillingness to<br>supervise<br>No/inadequate care provision      | –               | –                             |
| Manitoba                     | 18                          | 18                          | 12                                | –  | Inability/unwillingness to<br>supervise<br>No/inadequate care provision                     | ≤<br>50,000     | ≤ 24                          |
| New<br>Brunswick             | 19                          | 19                          | 12                                | –  | Abandonment/loss<br>Inability/unwillingness to<br>supervise<br>No/inadequate care provision | 240 –<br>10,200 | ≤ 3 only<br>repeat<br>offence |
| Newfoundland<br>and Labrador | 19                          | 16                          | –                                 | –  | Abandonment<br>No/inadequate care provision   | ≤<br>10,000     | ≤ 6                           |
| Northwest<br>Territories     | 19                          | 16                          | –                                 | –  | Abandonment<br>Inability/unwillingness to<br>supervise                                      | ≤<br>10,000     | ≤ 12                          |

|                      |    |    |    |   |  |                  |           |
|----------------------|----|----|----|---|--|------------------|-----------|
| Nova Scotia          | 19 | 16 | –  | – | Abandonment<br>Inability/unwillingness to supervise<br>Permitting criminal behaviour | –                | –         |
| Nunavut              | 19 | 16 | –  | – | Abandonment<br>Inability/unwillingness to supervise                                  | to $\leq$ 10,000 | $\leq$ 12 |
| Ontario              | 18 | 18 | 16 | – | No/inadequate care provision   | $\leq$ 5,000     | $\leq$ 12 |
| Prince Edward Island | 18 | 18 | –  | – | Abandonment<br>No/inadequate care provision  | $\leq$ 2,000     | –         |
| Quebec               | 18 | 18 | –  | 7 | Abandonment<br>No/inadequate care provision  | 625 – 5,000      | –         |
| Saskatchewan         | 18 | 16 | –  | – | Inability/unwillingness to supervise   | $\leq$ 25,000    | $\leq$ 24 |
| Yukon                | 19 | 19 | –  | – | Abandonment<br>Inability/unwillingness to supervise                                  | –                | –         |

*Sources:* Child Welfare, Majority and Traffic Safety Acts of all provinces and territories (see Endnote <sup>1</sup>)

Jurisprudence specifically related to child age and lack of supervision is limited, even where there is a statutory age limit. Indeed, in provinces with a statutory age limit, sometimes the courts applied the statutory rule. For example, the Queen's Bench in Manitoba stated that because children between 19 months and 8 years were left alone, protection was needed <sup>1</sup>. Other times, the courts weighed in contextual factors alongside age in reaching their decision. For instance, Manitoba Provincial Court rejected a claim of negligence when a mother left her 6-year-old child home alone for approximately 90 minutes. The Court considered age, as well as maturity level of the child and safety measures taken at home as substantial factors <sup>2</sup>. Similarly, in an Ontario case, the court found the mother negligent for leaving her 13-year-old daughter to care for her 6-year-old brother for unspecified period of time without proper arrangements<sup>3</sup>. Children's long history of absenteeism from school, mother's mental health issues and her neglect of children's emotional needs were important considerations in reaching the decision.

Where the Statutes are silent as to the age at which a child can be left home alone, the courts have weighed in their position. In a British Columbia decision, the Supreme Court found mother negligent for leaving her 8-year-old child home alone after school for two hours each weekday <sup>4</sup>. The Court agreed children under the age of 10 years do not have the cognitive ability to be left unsupervised, regardless of their maturity level and contextual factors. A similar decision was reached in Alberta, where a father specifically asked if his 11-year-old child could be left home alone for three hours after school <sup>5</sup>. The Court declared children under 12 years should not be left unattended by parents during parenting hours. Similarly, government authorities define "a safe and

<sup>1</sup> Wpg. C.F.S. v. H.(W.J.), C.(C.), T.(R.L.J.), 2002 MBQB 190 (paragraphs 46 to 48).

<sup>2</sup> R. v. Wong 2015 (MBPC 8)

<sup>3</sup> Children's Aid Society of Toronto v. M. (M.) 2016 (ONCJ 374)

<sup>4</sup> British Columbia (Director of Child, Family and Community Service) v. R. (B.) 2015 (BCSC 1658)

<sup>5</sup> SC v. JD, 2013 ABPC 220, par. 37 - 40.

stable environment for a child" in foster/kinship cases to include ensuring the child under 12 years is not left unsupervised (Alberta Human Services, 2012). In most cases, an analysis of lack of supervision of young children is included in a pattern of neglect that leads to a serious risk of harm for children under 12 years of age <sup>6</sup>. However, age in itself is not the only or determining factor. For example, in a Newfoundland case, a mother was accused with negligence for leaving her 2-year-old and 4-year-old children unattended on two accounts. For the first event, the Court found the mother negligent for leaving the children home alone for approximately two hours. Contextual circumstances such as bathtub full of cold water with floating toys, unlocked house door, dangerous location of the house, and a minor physical injury sustained by the younger child were determining factors. For the second event, the Court decided it was not negligent for the mother to leave her children alone in the car in a parking lot for 12 minutes, as the Court deemed there was no imminent danger, and the absence was brief. Similarly, in a Nova Scotia case, the Court found that leaving a 13-year-old child alone overnight in the home did not amount to adequate supervision of the child because that 13-year-old was not mature and not responsible enough <sup>7</sup>; while in another case in the same province, the Court found that leaving children under 5 and 2 years of age unattended for short periods of time (here the mother would exit the home to smoke) was acceptable <sup>8</sup>.

In short, jurisprudence specifically related to child age and lack of supervision is limited and varies across provinces and territories. In some cases, the courts considered age as the sole determining factor. In other cases, contextual factors such as the level of ability of the child and any special issues, the state of the home, the existence of any dangerous items, the length of time and reason(s) for the absence weighed-in as substantial considerations alongside the age of the child. Table 2 illustrates some of the factors considered by the Courts through a few selected cases.

**Table 2 Selected Jurisprudence on Children Home Alone in Canada (2015-2020)**

| <b>Jurisdiction – Relevant Legislation(s)</b>   | <b>Case Name</b>   | <b>Facts of supervisory situation</b>  | <b>Contextual factors highlighted by the Court</b>  |
|---|--|--|---|
| British Columbia – <i>Child, Family and Community Service Act</i> : ss. 2 (a-c), 13, and 21.1 | British Columbia (Director of Child, Family and Community Service) v. R. (B.) 2015 (BCSC 1658) | - Mother left 8-year-old child home alone, after school for two hours each weekday.          | - Young age and immaturity of the child.<br>- Mother’s uncooperative behavior with social worker and child welfare authority.<br>- Mother’s lack of awareness or recklessness of the risk involved in leaving child home alone.   |
| Manitoba – <i>Criminal Code</i> , R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46: ss. 214 and 218                       | R. v. Wong 2015 (MBPC 8)   | - Mother left 6-year-old child home alone for approximately 90 minutes on a single occasion. | - Safe environment: locked apartment, available food and activities, lack of drugs, alcohol, or dangerous items lying around.<br>- Maturity of the child.<br>- Mother’s appreciation and foreseeability of potential danger to child.<br>- No previous similar conduct. |

<sup>6</sup> For example, in Quebec, see *Protection de la Jeunesse - 131471*, 2013 QCCQ 8558; *Protection de la Jeunesse - 132014*, 2013 QCCQ 8548; and *Protection de la Jeunesse - 096898*, 2009 QCCQ 19285.

<sup>7</sup> *Mo v. Ma*, 2012 NSSC 159, par. 61 & 87.

<sup>8</sup> *FCSCC and MJK*, 2003 NSFC 27, see paragraphs 91 to 94.

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| Newfoundland and Labrador – <i>Criminal Code</i> , R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46: ss. 214 and 218   | R. v. Young 2019 (CarswellNfld 79)                             | 1 <sup>st</sup> event: mother left children, 2 years old and 4 years old, home alone for two hours and ten minutes.<br>2 <sup>nd</sup> event: mother left children alone in car in a parking lot for 12 minutes. | 1 <sup>st</sup> event - Unsafe environment: Unlocked house door, bathtub full of cold water with floating toys.<br>- Imminent risk of danger: Children found outside near a guardrail over a steep bank which leads down to the ocean. Lack of food and hygiene. Physical injury.<br>2 <sup>nd</sup> event - No imminent danger and brief absence |
| Ontario – <i>Child and Family Services Act</i> , R.S.O. 1990, c. C.11: s. 37(2)            | Children’s Aid Society of Toronto v. M.(M.) 2016 (ONCJ 374)    | Mother left 13-year-old daughter to care for 6-year-old brother for unspecified period of time without proper alternative arrangements.  | - Children’s long history of school absenteeism.<br>- Mother’s mental health issues: paranoia and emotional outbursts.<br>- Mother’s fails to protect children and neglects their emotional needs.  |
| Ontario – <i>Family Law Rules</i> , O. Reg. 114/99: r. 16                                  | Windsor-Essex Children’s Aid Society v. M.(K.) 2015 (ONCJ 553) | Parents left 1-year-old (G) and six-week-old (B) alone in their room for several hours in the morning.   | - B was found lifeless and not breathing.<br>- G was not fed nor her diaper was changed.<br>- G was in her bedroom and could be heard by the mother<br>- Unsafe sleeping practice employed with respect to B did not pose any risk of harm to G.<br>- G was happy and well-fed and there were no concerns with living arrangements.               |
| Alberta – <i>Child, Youth and Family Enhancement Act</i> , R.S.A. 2000: ss. 1, 19 and 130. | Calgary (Police Service) (Re) 2015 (76184 AB OIPC)             | - Mother left infant and a 2-year-old alone for 10 minutes in a car in a shopping center parking lot.  | - Imminent threat: potential safety concern for the two-year-old, as he had the skills to unlock the doors and exit the car.<br>- Young age and immaturity of the child.<br>- Prior similar incidents.  |

## Unsupervised children in need of protection and legal consequences

In situations related to lack of supervision, the law identifies several conditions for a child to become a child in need of protection (Table 1). Expressions vary widely across jurisdictions and include inability or unwillingness to provide adequate care, supervision or control of the child, failing to supervise and protect the child adequately, leaving a child unattended for an unreasonable length of time and failing to make adequate provision for the child’s care, and abandoning, deserting or losing a child. The burden of proof lies with the party bringing the case forward, i.e., the State through its Child Services Department. The State needs to prove (1) the child’s age, for those provinces that have an age limit, (2) that the child was left unattended and (3) that as a consequence, the child was in danger or suffered harm. However, in Ontario, the burden is reversed if the child is under ten years. In that case, the State would simply need to prove (1) that the child was under the age of ten years and (2) that the child was left unattended; the parents need then to prove that the child was not in danger.

When a person in charge of a child is found guilty under a Welfare Act, that person commits an offence and may be liable to a fine, imprisonment or both. As listed on Table 1, most provinces and territories provide for such an offence and for the subsequent possibility of penalties: a fine ranging from a minimum of \$240 to a maximum of \$50,000; imprisonment ranging from a

minimum of 3 months to a maximum of 24 months or both a fine and imprisonment; only New Brunswick does not provide for both. Of the provinces and territories that allow for a fine, only two provinces do not also allow for imprisonment (Quebec and Prince Edward Island). No such offence and penalty are provided for in the Welfare Acts of two provinces and one territory (i.e., British Columbia, Nova Scotia and Yukon).

In addition to penalties defined in the statutes of their respective provinces and territories, parents may also face criminal charges if they leave a child under the age of ten years unattended and they are found guilty of unlawfully abandoning or exposing their child so that the child's life is or is likely to be endangered or its health is or is likely to be permanently injured (s. 218 of the Canadian Criminal Code). In *R. v. A.D.H.*, [2013] 2 S.C.R. 269, the Supreme Court of Canada considered the issue of abandoning child as defined in s. 218 of the *Criminal Code*. The Court found that subjective intent was required to prove child abandonment beyond a reasonable doubt. This requires Crown to prove that the parent was aware and/or reckless with respect to the consequences of leaving the child and there was an exposure to risk that the child's life is or is likely to be endangered or its health is or is likely to be permanently injured.

## **Information and support programs for children home alone and their parents**

Public information provided to families and professionals does not always reflect the text of the law. For example, Toronto Children's Aid Societies (CAS) indicate on their online informational materials that "there is no law in Ontario that dictates a specific age at which a child can be left unsupervised" (n.d.). The Halton CAS also stated that "there is not specific age at which a child can be left unattended", however it specifies that the law "states that parents of children under the age of 16 years, must make "reasonable provisions' for their care" (n.d., p. 1).

Our online scan identified several agencies in Canada that offer programs to support parents and children who stay home alone or with other children. The types of programs (in English and/or French) included informational pamphlets and checklists, and youth trainings onsite and/or online. The Canada Safety Council (CSC) provides online checklists for safety (i.e., Telephone, Security, Fire Safety, First Aid, and Power Outages) and advises parents and children to communicate clearly and to prepare children for being home alone. CSC also provides structured onsite programs such as the Home Alone Program and the Babysitters Training Course in several provinces and territories as well as online. Through ten sessions (25 hours) of interactive group learning, the former provides children ten years of age and older with the skills and knowledge needed to stay home alone "for short periods of time." The Babysitters Training Course, aimed at children turning 12 years of age within the calendar year or older, includes information on issues ranging from child development and nutrition to games and basic first aid. Another program, the Babysitting training program offered directly by Red Cross Canada, is aimed at children between 11 and 15 years of age. Over the course of 7-8 hours, participants learn basic safety, first aid and caregiving skills, how to prevent and respond to emergencies, and how to promote themselves as a babysitter to prospective parents. The Red Cross also offers Stay Safe! program for children aged 9 years and older (ages change across provinces). It aims to increase young people's capacity to stay safe including when they are on their own. Both CSC and the Red Cross offer their programs in several provinces directly or in partnership with local organizations. Additionally, Child Safe Canada



offers the Home Alone Safety Plus First Aid and the Babysitter Plus First Aid programs to children aged ten years and older in Alberta. The former is an interactive safety training program that also covers first aid and comfort skills. The latter is offered to “responsible adolescents of ten years and up who want to become a babysitter or may already be one” (Child Safe Canada, 2020), and covers the responsibilities of a babysitter, care and safety tips for children of all ages, basic first aid and responding to an emergency. All programs provide participants with a babysitter's manual and completion card.

## **Methodology**

### **Legislation and case law**

The original manuscript (Ruiz-Casares & Radic, 2015) was updated for the January 2015 to August 2020 period via databases of the Canadian Legal Information Institute (CanLii), and Westlaw on legislative and jurisprudential information concerning child supervision. Keywords (i.e., “age”; “abandoned”; “abandonment”; “child”; “home alone”; “lack of supervision”; “need of protection”; “neglected”; “negligence”; “supervision”; “unattended children”; “unsupervised children”) yielded the pertinent legal provisions, which in turn helped identify examples in case law. In order to broaden the search and capture relevant cases, Family Acts of each province and territory were examined, in addition to the updated versions of the Welfare and Transportation Acts for each province and territory. To establish the legal definition of “child” or “minor”, the legal age of majority for each province and territory was noted first. Similarly, a definition of “child” under the Welfare Acts was documented in order to establish whether there was a different (lower) age at which parents could leave their child alone or unattended at home or if they were bound by the age of majority or other age limit set by the welfare Act. Situations of lack of supervision where the Welfare Act provides for intervention by State authorities to protect the child as well as possible legal consequences parents could face if found guilty of an offence under the Welfare Act for lack of supervision were recorded. These results were entered into an Excel database and all source documents were stored into a separate file and linked for easy access.

### **Social services and data**

Websites from Children’s Aid Societies and other Canadian organizations offering guidance to parents and caregivers on safety and other issues related to child care and supervision and from babysitting or self-care training and certification for young adolescents were searched in 2015 using keywords such as “age”, “home alone”; “unattended”; and “unsupervised”. The name and address of each organization meeting the inclusion criteria, as well as the name, type (such as printed material, training, etc.), geographic coverage, and description of relevant program(s) were recorded in an Excel database. All results were analyzed within and across all provinces and territories; similarities and contradictions across data sources were documented. All services mentioned in the original manuscript were checked for accuracy and up-to-date information in 2020.

## **Limitations**

Data gathering for this study concluded in August 2020, hence the information hereby contained reflects the state of legislation, jurisprudence, and social services as of that date. In addition, the review of jurisprudence used set keywords across all provinces and territories, yet it did not constitute a systematic review of all Court decisions on supervisory neglect. Finally, social services programs were identified over the internet. Accordingly, organizations that do not have websites or if their websites were in a language other than English or French or their program information was not up to date may not be included in our study.

## **Conclusion**

Despite public and professional concern about the lack of clear guidelines about when children can be left home alone, there has been no legislative response. Our review of child welfare legislation across all 13 Canadian jurisdictions reveals that only three provinces have a minimum age at which children can be left at home unsupervised and only one establishes an age limit for leaving children unsupervised in a vehicle. In their application and interpretation of the law, the Courts have considered age among several other factors, thus indicating the need to assess adequate care and supervision on a case-by-case basis. Chronological age is not the solely determining factor when assessing adequacy of supervision because some children are able to take care of themselves for a limited period of time at a young age whereas others will never be able to be home alone safely (Ruiz-Casares et al., 2012). Balancing chronological age with child capacity and a number of environmental factors (such as accessibility of other adults, duration and frequency of unsupervised time, and neighbourhood safety) is needed in decision-making involving young people (Ruiz-Casares et al., 2012). Indeed, finding a balance between protection and autonomy is a complex issue not solved by the mere establishment of a minimum legal age. Moreover, empirical evidence for determining the optimal minimum legal age for leaving children unsupervised is lacking. The development of home safety checklists and supervision guidelines that include child, caregiver, and environmental factors has been advocated by researchers (Coohey, 2003; Hardoff, 2012; Ruiz-Casares, Trocmé, & Fallon 2012).

In this context, many parents and caregivers turn to child-focused social services organizations that provide printed information as well as training activities such as babysitting courses and certification. These organizations largely advise that children under 12 years should not be left at home alone or put in charge of younger children, yet families need to reconcile seemingly contradictory messages as some home alone and babysitting courses are offered to children as young as ten years (even in provinces with higher statutory age limits for child supervision) and some of the information publicly provided may not accurately reflect the full and/or exact content of the law.

Considering the multiplicity of determinants of child wellbeing, the establishment of a legal minimum age will not adequately protect all children. Nonetheless, accurate information should be provided to the public so that decision-makers at all levels—from caregivers to case workers, have a clear indication of what constitutes appropriate care in their community and the dangers associated with lack of supervision (for example, Duzinski et al., 2014). Although organizations may understandably want to convey that age is not the only factor in determining whether a child



can be left unsupervised for any period of time, more emphasis should be put on disseminating accurate information.

**About the authors:**

Mónica Ruiz-Casares is an Associate Professor at McGill University Department of Psychiatry and an Investigator at the Sherpa University Institute. Deniz Kilinc is a JD student at Queens University.

**Acknowledgement:**

Thank you to Ivana Radic, co-author of the original document on which this information sheet is based.

**Suggested citation:**

Ruiz-Casares, M. & Kilinc, D. (2021). Legal Age for Leaving Children Unsupervised Across Canada. CWRP Information Sheet #213E. Montreal, QC: Canadian Child Welfare Research Portal.

## References

- Ablewhite, J., Peel, I., McDaid, L., Hawkins, A., Goodenough, T., Deave, T., . . . Kendrick, D. (2015). Parental perceptions of barriers and facilitators to preventing child unintentional injuries within the home: a qualitative study. *BMC Public Health*, 15(1). doi:10.1186/s12889-015-1547-2
- Alberta Human Services. What is considered to be a safe and stable environment for a child? (2012). Available from <http://www.humanservices.alberta.ca/foster-kinship-care/15441.html>. [Accessed December 14, 2020]
- Canadian Red Cross. (2020). Babysitting. Available at: <https://www.redcross.ca/training-and-certification/course-descriptions/first-aid-at-home-courses/babysitting> [Accessed December 14, 2020]
- Canadian Red Cross. (2020). Stay Safe! Available at: <https://www.redcross.ca/training-and-certification/course-descriptions/first-aid-at-home-courses/stay-safe> [Accessed December 14, 2020]
- Canada Safety Council. (2020). Training for Youth. Available at: <https://canadasafetycouncil.org/product-category/for-youth/> [Accessed December 14, 2020]
- Child Safe Canada. (2020). Youth (ages 8+). Available at: [https://childsafecanada.com/programs/youth\\_ages\\_8](https://childsafecanada.com/programs/youth_ages_8) [Accessed December 14, 2020]
- Coohey, C. (2003). "Defining and Classifying Supervisory Neglect." *Child Maltreatment*, 8(2):145-156. doi: 10.1177/1077559502250786.
- . 2008. "The nature of parental supervisory neglect." *Child Welfare*, 87(4):55-77.
- DePanfilis, D. (2006). *Child Neglect: A Guide for Prevention, Assessment, and Intervention*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families.
- Duzinski, S. V., Barczyk, A.N., Wheeler, T.C., Iyer, S. S., & Lawson, K.A. (2014). "Threat of paediatric hyperthermia in an enclosed vehicle: a year-round study." *Injury Prevention*, 20(4):220-225. doi: 10.1136/injuryprev-2013-040910.
- Fern, E. F. (1982). "The Use of Focus Groups for Idea Generation: The Effects of Group Size, Acquaintanceship, and Moderator on Response Quantity and Quality." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19:1-13.
- Flynn, C. P., & Rodman, H. 1989. "Latchkey children and after-school care: A feminist dilemma?" *Policy Studies Review*, 8(3):663-673.
- Halton CAS. Guidelines for Leaving Your Child Alone or Babysitting. Children's Aid Society of Halton (n/d). Available from <http://haltoncas.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/CASBabysittingGuidelines.pdf> [Accessed December 14, 2020]
- Hardoff, D. (2012). "Legal and ethical issues in adolescents' health care." *Georgian medical news* (210):18-23.
- Hélie, S., Collin-Vézina, D., Turcotte, D., Trocmé, N., & Girouard, N. (2017). *Quebec Incidence Study 2014 (ÉIQ-2014): Final Report*. Available at: <https://cwrp.ca/publications/quebec-incidence-study-2014-eiq-2014-final-report> [Accessed December 14, 2020]
- Hussey, J. M., J. J. Chang, & J. B. Kotch. (2006). "Child Maltreatment in the United States: Prevalence, Risk Factors, and Adolescent Health Consequences." *Pediatrics*, 118(3):933-942. doi: 10.1542/peds.2005-2452.

- Panzino, F., Quintillá, J. M., Luaces, C., & Pou, J. (2013). "Ahogamientos por inmersión no intencional. Análisis de las circunstancias y perfil epidemiológico de las víctimas atendidas en 21 servicios de urgencias españoles." *Anales de Pediatría*, 78(3):178-184. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.anpedi.2012.06.014>.
- Petrass, L. A Blitvich, J. D., & Finch, C. F. (2011). "Lack of caregiver supervision: a contributing factor in Australian unintentional child drowning deaths, 2000-2009." *Medical journal of Australia*, 195(3):157.
- Petrass, L. A Blitvich, J. D., & Finch, C. F. (2009). "Parent/Caregiver Supervision and Child Injury: A Systematic Review of Critical Dimensions for Understanding This Relationship." *Family & Community Health*, 32(2):123-135 10.1097/FCH.0b013e3181994740.
- Richardson, J. L., Dwyer, K., McGuigan, K., Hansen, W. B., Dent, C., Anderson Johnson, C., Sussman, S. Y., Brannon, B., & Flay. B. (1989). "Substance Use Among Eighth-Grade Students Who Take Care of Themselves After School." *Pediatrics*, 84(3):556-566.
- Ruiz-Casares, M., & Radic, I. (2015). Legal Age for Leaving Children Unsupervised Across Canada. In *Information sheet 144E*. Montreal: Canadian Child Welfare Research Portal.
- Ruiz-Casares, M., Rousseau, C., Currie, J., & Heymann, J. (2012). "'I Hold on to my Teddy Bear Really Tight': Results from a Child Online Survey on Being Home Alone." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 82(1):97-103.
- Ruiz-Casares, M., Trocmé, N., & Fallon, B. (2012). "Supervisory neglect and risk of harm. Evidence from the Canadian Child Welfare System." *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 36(6):471-480. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2012.03.005.
- Toronto CAS. Home Alone. (n/d). Home Alone – How do you know when your kids can be left unsupervised? Children's Aid Society of Toronto. Available from [http://torontocas.ca/sites/torontocas/files/FS\\_HomeAlone\\_English.pdf](http://torontocas.ca/sites/torontocas/files/FS_HomeAlone_English.pdf)
- van Beelen, M., van Beeck, E., den Hertog, P., Beirens, T., & Raat, H. (2013). "Correlates of Unsupervised Bathing of Infants: A Cross-Sectional Study." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 10(3):856-866.

---

<sup>i</sup> *Table 1 Sources:* Alberta: Child, Youth and Family Enhancement Act, RSA 2000, c C.12, Age of Majority Act, RSA 2000, c A-6 & Traffic Safety Act, RSA 2000, c T-6; British Columbia: Child, Family and Community Service Act, RSBC 1996, c 46, Age of Majority Act, RSBC 1996, c 7 & Motor Vehicle Act, RSBC 1996, c 318; Manitoba: The Child and Family Services Act, CCSM c C80, The Age of Majority Act, CCSM c A7 & The Highway Traffic Act, CCSM c H60; New Brunswick: Family Services Act, SNB 1980, c. F-2.2, Age of Majority Act, RSNB 2011, c 103, Motor Vehicle Act, RSNB 1973, c M-17 & Provincial Offences Procedure Act, SNB 1987, c P-22.1; Newfoundland and Labrador: Children and Youth Care and Protection Act, SNL 2010, c. C-12.2, Age of Majority Act, SNL 1995, c A-4.2 & Highway Traffic Act, RSNL 1990, c H-3; Northwest Territories: Child and Family Services Act, SNWT 1997, c.13, Age of Majority Act, RSNWT 1988, c A-2 & Motor Vehicles Act, RSNWT 1988, c M-16; Nova Scotia: Children and Family Services Act, SNS 1990, c 5, Age of Majority Act, RSNS 1989, c 4 & Motor Vehicle Act, RSNS 1989, c 293; Nunavut: Child and Family Services Act, SNWT (Nu) 1997, c 13, Age of Majority Act, RSNWT (Nu) 1988, c A-2 & Motor Vehicles Act, RSNWT (Nu) 1988, c M-16; Ontario: Child and Family Services Act, RSO 1990, C.11, Age of Majority and Accountability Act, RSO 1990, c A.7 & Highway Traffic Act, RSO 1990, c H.8; Prince Edward Island: Child Protection Act, RSPEI 1988, c C-5.1, Age of Majority Act, RSPEI 1988, c A-8 & Highway Traffic Act, RSPEI 1988, c H-5; Quebec: Youth Protection Act, CQLR c P-34.1, Civil Code of Québec, LRQ, c C-1991 & Highway Security Code, CQLR c C-24.2; Saskatchewan: The Child and Family Services Act, SS 1989-90, c C-7.2, The Age of Majority Act, RSS 1978, c A-6 & The All-Terrain Vehicles Act, SS 1988-89, c A-18.02; Yukon: Child and Family Services Act, RSY 2008, c. 1, Age of Majority Act, RSY 2002, c 2 & Motor Vehicles Act, RSY 2002, c 153.