



**First Session — Thirty-Second Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**STANDING COMMITTEE**  
on  
**STATUTORY REGULATIONS**  
and  
**ORDERS**

31 Elizabeth II

*Chairman*  
*Mr. Don Scott*  
*Constituency of Inkster*



MG-8048

**VOL. XXX No. 6 - 10:00 a.m., THURSDAY, 24 JUNE, 1982.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

---

Name	Constituency	Party
<b>ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)</b>	Ste. Rose	NDP
<b>ANSTETT, Andy</b>	Springfield	NDP
<b>ASHTON, Steve</b>	Thompson	NDP
<b>BANMAN, Robert (Bob)</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>BLAKE, David R. (Dave)</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>BROWN, Arnold</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>BUCKLASCHUK, John M.</b>	Gimli	NDP
<b>CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.</b>	Brandon West	NDP
<b>CORRIN, Brian</b>	Ellice	NDP
<b>COWAN, Hon. Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent</b>	St. Boniface	NDP
<b>DODICK, Doreen</b>	Riel	NDP
<b>DOERN, Russell</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>DOLIN, Mary Beth</b>	Kildonan	NDP
<b>DOWNEY, James E.</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>ENNS, Harry</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>EYLER, Phil</b>	River East	NDP
<b>FILMON, Gary</b>	Tuxedo	PC
<b>FOX, Peter</b>	Concordia	NDP
<b>GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>GRAHAM, Harry</b>	Virten	PC
<b>HAMMOND, Gerrie</b>	Kirkfield Park	PC
<b>HARAPIAK, Harry M.</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>HARPER, Elijah</b>	Rupertsland	NDP
<b>HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>HYDE, Lloyd</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>JOHNSTON, J. Frank</b>	Sturgeon Creek	PC
<b>KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene</b>	Seven Oaks	NDP
<b>KOVNATS, Abe</b>	Niakwa	PC
<b>LECUYER, Gérard</b>	Radisson	NDP
<b>LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al</b>	St. James	NDP
<b>MALINOWSKI, Donald M.</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>MANNES, Clayton</b>	Morris	PC
<b>McKENZIE, J. Wally</b>	Roblin-Russell	PC
<b>MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)</b>	St. Norbert	PC
<b>NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)</b>	Assiniboia	PC
<b>OLESON, Charlotte</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Donald</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.</b>	Selkirk	NDP
<b>PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson</b>	Transcona	NDP
<b>PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland</b>	Fort Rouge	NDP
<b>PHILLIPS, Myrna A.</b>	Wolseley	NDP
<b>PLOHMAN, John</b>	Dauphin	NDP
<b>RANSOM, A. Brian</b>	Turtle Mountain	PC
<b>SANTOS, Conrad</b>	Burrows	NDP
<b>SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic</b>	Rossmere	NDP
<b>SCOTT, Don</b>	Inkster	NDP
<b>SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)</b>	Fort Garry	PC
<b>SMITH, Hon. Muriel</b>	Osborne	NDP
<b>STEEN, Warren</b>	River Heights	PC
<b>STORIE, Jerry T.</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>URUSKI, Hon. Bill</b>	Interlake	NDP
<b>USKIW, Hon. Samuel</b>	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
<b>WALDING, Hon. D. James</b>	St. Vital	NDP

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON STATUTORY REGULATIONS AND ORDERS**  
**Thursday, 24 June, 1982**

**Time — 10:00 a.m.**

**CHAIRMAN — Mr. D. Scott.**

**MS C. DEPAPE, Clerk of the Committees:** Committee come to order. Since Mr. Fox is no longer a member of the Committee we will have to elect a new Chairman. Are there any nominations?

Mr. Kostyra.

**MR. E. KOSTYRA:** I would nominate the Member for Inkster.

**MS C. DEPAPE:** Are there any further nominations? Seeing none, Mr. Scott, would you please take the Chair.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, D. Scott:** First off we can start with either finishing up Bill No. 2 and Bill No. 19 and then go on to Bill No. 21. I will leave it at the will of the Committee. Is it the will of the Committee to continue with the present format? (Agreed) We're on Section 42 of Bill 2. Mr. Corrin.

**BILL NO. 2 - THE RESIDENTIAL  
RENT REGULATION ACT**

**MR. B. CORRIN:** I'd like to move an amendment in accordance with our predetermined arrangement made at the end of our last meeting with respect to Section 16 of this bill. It's an incredibly long amendment, do you have it in writing?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do you have it in writing?

**MR. B. CORRIN:** Has the Legislative Counsel submitted it to you?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Oh, okay.

**MR. B. CORRIN:** Do any of the members here want this particular amendment read into the record, it's three pages in length? The Member for Tuxedo has strong feelings, if he does I'm going to suggest that he read it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Filmon.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'll just say, on a procedural matter, we've always read things into the record but if the committee is willing to accept it as printed that's okay, I understand the Member for Ellie's reluctance to read three pages.

**MR. B. CORRIN:** Well, we can do it responsively if the burden is shared by the committee then we can all do it together, I'll read the first part and someone can read the second paragraph and so on. But if that's acceptable then I take it we have an agreement that it will be introduced to the record as it is printed and has been submitted by Legislative Counsel to the Chairperson of the Committee. I am advised by the Chair-

person that he is in receipt of it and it's in proper form.

(Submitted but not read)

**MOTION** Increase on voluntary vacating of single family units, etc. 16(2) Where the tenant of residential premises in a building in which there are not more than 3 separate residential premises

(a) has voluntarily given notice to the landlord of his intention to vacate the residential premises; or

(b) dies and is not survived by a spouse or dependent who had occupied the premises with the tenant at the time of death of the tenant;

notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a landlord, upon serving on the director a statement of those facts, substantiated in a manner prescribed in the regulations and receiving acknowledgement from the director of the service of the statement and that the facts have been substantiated to the satisfaction of the director either from the statement or by an investigation undertaken under subsection (3), may increase the rent for the residential premises

(c) by an amount that is greater than the increase in rent permitted under the regulations; or

(d) before the expiration of 12 months from the date of the next previous increase in the rent for the residential premises; or

(e) both by an amount that is greater than the increase in rent permitted under the regulations and before the expiration of 12 months from the date of the next previous increase in the rent for the residential premises;

but upon another tenant taking possession of the residential premises, the landlord shall notify the director

(f) of the amount of the increase in rent took effect which shall not be earlier than the date on which the other tenant takes possession.

**Investigation by director.** 16(3) For the purpose of substantiating the facts referred to in clause (2)(a) or (b), the director may refer the matter to a rent regulation officer to conduct an investigation as to the circumstances relating to the vacating of the residential premises or the interests of any spouse or dependent of the deceased tenant, as the case may require, and to report the results of the investigation to the director.

**Application for increase re vacated premises.** 16(4) Where the tenant of residential premises in a building in which there are more than 3 separate residential premises

(a) has voluntarily given notice to the landlord of his intention to vacate the residential premises; or

(b) dies or is not survived by a spouse or dependent who had occupied the premises with the tenant at the time of the death of the tenant;

notwithstanding that 12 months have not expired from the date on which the next previous increase on the rent for the residential premises first came into effect, the landlord may apply for an increase in rent for residential premises

(c) by an amount that is greater than the increase in rent permitted under the regulations; or

(d) before the expiration of 12 months from the date of the next previous increase in the rent for the residential premises;

(e) both by an amount that is greater than the increase in rent permitted under the regulations and before the expiration of the 12 months from the date of the next previous increase in the rent for the residential premises;

by serving on the director an application for the increase in the rent.

Procedure on application. 16(5) The director shall refer an application under subsection (4) to a rent regulation officer who shall deal with the application in the same manner as an application by a landlord under section 21 except that he may proceed to consider the application ex parte and without notice to any tenant of the residential premises.

Rent increase 16(6) Where, on an application under subsection (4), a rent regulation officer is satisfied that the rent paid by the vacating or deceased tenant for the residential premises to which the application relates is below the average of rents payable for other similar or comparable residential premises in the same building and that the reason for the low rent was not solely or primarily the conditions of supply and demand for such residential premises at the time the vacating or deceased tenant went into possession or renewed a tenancy agreement, the rent regulation officer may in writing recommend that the landlord may increase the rent for the residential premises

(a) by an amount that is greater than the increase in rent permitted under the regulations; or

(b) before the expiration of 12 months from the date of the next previous increase in the rent for the residential premises; or

(c) both by an amount that is greater than the increase in rent permitted under the regulations and before the expiration of 12 months from the date of the next previous increase in the rent for the residential premises.

Authority to increase. 16(7) Where, on an application under subsection (4), the rent regulation officer makes a recommendation which is confirmed under subsection 25(3), or on an appeal from a recommendation of the rent regulation officer respecting an application under subsection (4), a panel issues an order

(a) authorizing the landlord to increase the rent for the residential premises by an amount that is greater than the increase in rent permitted under the regulations; or

(b) authorizing the landlord to increase the rent before the expiration of 12 months from the date of the next previous increase in the rent for the residential premises; or

(c) authorizing the landlord both to increase the rent for the residential premises by an amount that is greater than the increase in rent permitted under the regulations and to increase the rent before the expiration of 12 months from the date of the next previous increase in the rent for the residential premises;

the landlord, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, may increase the rent for the residential premises in accordance with the recommendation or the order, as the case may be. (End of amendment)

The effect of this is to deal with the problem that was raised by landlords with respect to situations where tenants had been given special compassionate treatment for a variety of reasons. Some landlords, I think, indicated that they had elderly tenants that they gave special preference to with respect to rent increases; other landlords during the course of private consultation and some during the hearing of public delegations indicated that they gave special treatment to people with various handicaps and so on and so forth. They were concerned that the regulatory program, as proposed, would have a deleterious effect on their ability to regain any sort of market, if not economic rent, as a result of the artificial deflation of that unit's value as caused by the special compassionate treatment given to the tenant. So we are proposing that, in these cases where a suite is voluntarily vacated by the tenant - and these would include cases, not to be facetious, where a tenant has passed away as well - that there will be the situation where the landlord can then recover lost rents and the ordinary provisions of the regulatory program will not apply in such circumstances.

Very basically the treatment, as recited in these three long pages, is as follows: "With respect to cases where there are more than three separate residential premises in a building, the basis for the increase will essentially be comparability." In other words, one of the factors that the Rent Regulation Officer and Panel will be asked to examine and assess will be the comparative rents in the building affected by the application for an increase. We felt that was the fairest way to make provision for this sort of special consideration in that respect.

We had a bit of a problem with respect to the smaller buildings. We didn't quite know how we could deal with that in the sense it would be virtually impossible to apply the same type of standard or formula in the case of buildings of fewer than three units. So in those cases, in the case of a voluntary vacation of a unit, the market will essentially be the determinate. By way of short explanation and justification of the differential treatment, we do not feel that, in the case of the smaller tenancy situations, that it will have any real bearing or influence on the total market, in the sense that it would be a major deviation from the general regulatory program that we're putting in place and we propose to put in place. So that, I think, is briefly an explanation and we'd be quite pleased to entertain questions if that is the wish of other members.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Filmon.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've had

the opportunity to discuss this somewhat with the Minister and, just for my own understanding of it, the differences between this amendment and the one which I had left with the Minister as we adjourned the last Sitting, is that this splits the two categories into rental units that occur in triplexes or smaller and those above three units and it adds the restriction in those units that are above three unit complexes, it adds the restriction that they will be compared to the market in that complex and therefore they will not be able to rise above the market in that complex. Is that correct? Those are the two major changes then, plus the procedural matters are spelled out more clearly about the application to the director and so on. I know they're very complex. Mine was two pages and this is three pages and it's a little difficult to compare, but essentially those are the changes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Section 16 as amended—pass.  
Mr. Kostyra.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Yes, just to comment. The Member for Tuxedo is correct. The basic change from what he had indicated to me, that he was to propose, was the two factors that he mentioned.

One, with respect to those complexes, those rental units in excess of three units, would be allowed on voluntary vacated premises to move up to the comparable level of rent for similar suites in the same complex and in essence his proposal has been accepted for those units that are contained in rental suites that are of three or less.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Can I just clarify, as well, Mr. Chairman, that this now gives the flexibility for the Rent Regulation Review Office to consider situations where people voluntarily vacate after a longstanding term in a rental premise that, if they leave voluntarily midterm or if someone should die and so on, that there is the opportunity for the landlord to then move in and do whatever improvements, painting, decorating, whatever and apply for an increase at that time and is not bound by one increase every 12 month limitation under those special circumstances as well. That's taken care of here. Is that correct?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Yes, it is. Again, only to the maximum, in the case of rental units or complexes in excess of three suites, subject to the maximum of the comparable rent for similar units in that complex.

It's really to take care of a situation that was brought to our attention, as the member will recall, during the public presentations to this Committee wherein a number of landlords outlined situations where particular tenants, for reasons of that tenant's economic situation or longstanding period of time that they've rented with that particular landlord, where they're paying rents considerably lower than the going rate within that complex and that, once that person leaves, it was felt that the landlord shouldn't be forced to maintain that situation when, indeed, the actual rent levels for similar suites was considerably higher. It's really to take care of that particular situation, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. G. FILMON:** No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Fine. Section 16 as amended—pass.  
Now we move on to Section 42—pass; Section 43—pass; Okay, one second, Mr. Tallin would like to make a comment.

**MR. R. TALLIN:** We have the French version of the Motions that were made last week, or rather earlier this week. We don't have the French version for what has been presented this morning.

In addition, in preparing the French version of the Amendments, the translators came across a number of what they thought were areas that could be improved in the French version. Anybody who wants copies of the French version of the Motion can have them, we have copies of them here. But I would like permission of the Committee to make further changes in the French version to improve the language that is used if that is permissible and also to put in the French amendments.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is that agreed? (Agreed)  
Mr. Kovnats.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** A question to the Legal Counsel. I hope I haven't misunderstood. Am I led to believe that the French version is different than the English version?

**MR. R. TALLIN:** I don't think that it's different in any substantive way although I'll have to ask the translator. They just thought that in some cases there would be better language used to express the same idea. Is that correct? In some cases it's a matter of consistency in the French language where they've used different language in the French to express the same idea where the same language is being used in the English version, and that sort of thing.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I don't want to really extend on it. I was just a little bit confused as to the statement and I thought that maybe they had come up with a better law for the French version than they had for the English version and I thought it was a little unfair but I think I had misunderstood and I understand that now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Preamble —pass; Title —pass; Bill be reported —pass.

### **BILL NO. 19 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Next we'll move on to Bill 19. An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.

We'll wait till the Clerk gets the amendments passed and we'll go clause-by-clause. Shall we proceed?

Section 1. 2.1(1)(a)—pass; 2.1(1)(b)—pass; 2.11(c) Mr. Corrin.

**MR. B. CORRIN:** I have an amendment, Mr. Chairperson, in this respect I would propose

THAT this clause of the Landlord and Tenant Act as set out in Section 1 of the bill be struck and the following clause substituted:

"Except in the case of service required under Sections 70, 77, 104 or 108, by mailing it postage prepaid by registered or certified mail addressed to the person

at the latest address of the person, known to the person required to give or serve it."

Just very generally, the reason for this is to attempt to standardize the giving and sending of notices with respect to the various provisions of this Act. These are notices that pass, of course, between landlords and tenants and the specific change here is that notices, generally, will be capable now of being served by registered or certified mail in the manner set out in the amendment, as opposed to personal service, with the exception of the four sections recited and mentioned in the amendment. These four sections all deal essentially with notices for Orders of Possession. These are cases where a landlord is moving to evict a tenant and remove him or her from occupation of a premises. So it was felt generally that, in these circumstances, we should retain the requirement that service be personally affected.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is there any comment? Section 2.1(1)(c) as amended—pass; Section 2.1(2)—pass; That is the finish of Section 1.

Page 2. Are there any amendments on Page 2? Page 2—pass; Page 3. Are there any amendments on Page 3? Page 3—pass;

Page 4. We have an amendment here I believe. Do you want to go section-by-section? Sections 11 to 16 were each read and passed. Section 17.

Mr. Corrin.

**MR. B. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairperson, I'm moving an amendment

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding, immediately after Section 17, the following section:

Subsection 111(2) of the Act is repealed and the following subsection is substituted therefor:

Service of Order 111(2) in order for possession granted under Section 110, shall be served on the tenant to whom it is directed.

To explain this, basically we're providing a concession here with respect to provisions that were considered to be somewhat onerous with respect to the obligations that the Act formerly imposed upon landlords respecting the requirement that Orders for Possession, these are orders that were made by the court after proceedings were dealt with in a judicial manner, requiring that those orders be personally served on tenants to whom they were directed. In a sense, the amendment is to remove that requirement and therefore such orders could in the future be affected by mailing, registered or certified mail, addressed to the person at his or her latest address. The feeling was that a person who had already received notice of a hearing, by way of personal service and notice of the landlord's wish to make an application for an order for possession and a person who had participated in a hearing or had defaulted and not attended a hearing after receiving proper personal notice, was probably not going to be prejudiced by mail delivery of the actual order. It's a small step to try and ameliorate the effects of the Act as it affects landlords.

Sometimes we're advised that personal service can be somewhat costly and in these circumstances, it was perceived as being probably redundant.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay, are there any further comments? Section 17 as amended—pass; Section 18—pass; Section 19

Mr. Corrin.

**MR. B. CORRIN:** This is an amendment, Mr. Chairperson.

THAT the proposed subsection 116(1) of The Landlord and Tenant Act set out in Section 19 of Bill 19 be amended by striking out the words and figure "and not more than 4 months" in the 4th and 5th line thereof.

This is simply to bring the provision with respect to The Landlord and Tenant Act into line with the changes that were made earlier in the week to the residential rent regulation bill.

Members will recollect that the provision that notice of rental increase be made within a 3- to 4-month period prior to the termination of the rental period was changed insofar as the ceiling was taken off. There will be a minimal provision that there be notice prior to 3 months, but it could be more than 4. It could, for that matter, be anything between 3, I suppose, and 12, depending on the circumstances.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are there any comments?

Section 116(1) as amended—pass; 116(1.1)—pass; 116(1.2) - I believe there's an amendment here, Mr. Corrin?

**MR. B. CORRIN:** THAT the proposed subsection 116(1.2) of The Landlord and Tenant Act as set out in Section 19 of Bill 19 be amended by striking out the words and figures "subsection (1.1) does" in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the words and figures "subsections (1.1) and (2) do."

So, again, it's in order to affect consistency between The Landlord and Tenant Act and the rent regulation bill.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Section 116 (1.2) as amended—pass; Section 19 as amended—pass; Section 20—pass; Section 21—pass; Section 22—pass; Section 23—pass; Page 6—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass; Bill be reported. That finishes Bill No. 19.

## BILL NO. 21 - THE COMMUNITY CHILD DAY CARE STANDARDS ACT

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Next we have on the agenda Bill No. 21 The Community Child Day Care Standards Act. We have a number of persons wishing to appear before the committee and I would like to, unless the Minister wants to make any . . . Ms Phillips would you like to make any introductory comments?

Mr. Evans.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, I think the usual procedure is for us to hear the delegations and get their suggestions, comments and then from there proceed to clause-by-clause.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** First off could I call Mrs. Aleda Turnbull.

Mr. Eyler.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Could I suggest you call for any out-

of-town presentations first if there are any?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is that the wish of the committee? (Agreed) Mrs. Turnbull would you mind if there are any out-of-town delegations we could hear them first. It's 10:30 now and we have, I would say, close to 30 people to hear, so do we have any out-of-town delegations? Ma'am could you please identify yourself?

**MS G. CORDES:** I'm sorry, I'm not from out of town, but with baby-sitter problems and what not, I just wonder if I could present; I'm No. 2 on the list so I think I do take objection to that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We'll get there this morning, I'm sure.

**MS G. CORDES:** I'll have to leave at 11:30 to meet my children.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay, is there anybody from out of town then? First off, someone with another emergency. Yes, Mr. Kovnats.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I think that possibly we're bending the rules and I'm not against bending the rules because you have to give consideration to some people but, just as was just brought up, there are some other problems for people that are in town and they should be given the same consideration. Might I suggest that we proceed in the manner in which the list is printed and could we have a copy of the list.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I'm sure you can.  
Mr. Minister.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, in keeping with Mr. Kovnats' suggestion, the Member for Niakwa, I think what we should do is try to be as accommodating as we can to the people here and, therefore, what I would suggest is we hear those who do have to get away who happen to live in Winnipeg, or wherever, plus those who do come from out of town. I think the member would agree that we want to accommodate those who will have difficulties so I think in that way we will be fair to everybody and I don't think it'll cause us undue dislocation in our proceedings.

So, I'd like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we hear those, first of all, who definitely have to get away, although I must say, Mr. Chairman, we will be meeting, if necessary, tonight as well and tomorrow and I believe on Saturday morning as well if necessary, so we're prepared to sit as long as we have to to hear everyone out and to get the views of the various organizations and individuals.

To facilitate, in a reasonable way, is to find out who on the list must get away, for instance, this morning and then after that go to those who are from out of town and who may be inconvenienced by not being brought up earlier, rather than later.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I've got to agree with the Honourable Minister that there's nothing wrong with what he has said, except that with the type of association that these people have most of them would be wanting to get away and there's no reason for them not to be

wanting to get away, inasmuch they are mostly in a business that requires their personal attention and I don't think that we can give that special consideration; inasmuch as these people might be a little reluctant to make a complaint; inasmuch as they are making a presentation and they want to be heard fairly. I think that maybe we should follow the rules and not bend them as was originally suggested and just carry on with the list the way it is. I know we're wasting time but . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** My concern is that we're already starting to waste time, I'd like to start off by bending the rules and ask Ms Cordes if she would come forward please.

**MSG. CORDES:** Thank you very much for this opportunity and I suggest my particular problem is what this Bill is addressing and I appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak quickly.

My name is Georgia Cordes and I'm here today representing the YWCA. The YWCA appreciates this opportunity to verbally express our wholehearted support for the introduction of a Community Child Day Care Standards Act. Such an Act has long been a goal of our association.

One of the primary goals of the YWCA, historically, has been to develop the potential of girls and women through a wide variety of growth experiences and to nurture and support the broad concepts of the Womens' Movement until true equality of opportunity has been achieved.

We have a longstanding concern with child care services arising from our commitment to women. In particular, the roles they take as mothers, as well as members of the labour market and volunteer sectors, heighten our need for social assessment of child care supports to the family unit. Both community and parent share responsibility for children. The community responsibility is to recognize and meet the legitimate needs of today's family. Day care centres can act as a resource to assist in enriching parenting abilities.

Acting out of community concern the Winnipeg YWCA has responded to certain child care needs of the family through its varied recreation programming for children during holiday and vacation periods. In addition, it has provided a child care service for a number of years for children of all the participants taking part in programming; for volunteers working on behalf of the YWCA; for students attending classes at the nearby Adult Education Centre; and for women requiring such services on an occasional basis while downtown.

In December of 1977, the YWCA made a presentation to the United Way Commission on child care services in Manitoba endorsing the following: That quality day care should be accessible to those requiring it, regardless of economic status; that day-care funding and programs be developmental and preventative in direction; that day care respond to children with special needs; that day care be implemented by trained staff, rather than volunteers and that their salaries be adequate; that Lunch-and-After-School programs be an integral part of day care; that day care meet the needs of families of school-age children during school holiday and vacation periods.

In 1979, a letter was sent to the Provincial Government supporting and urging implementation of the United Way study on day care, with further focus on a more active role for the Provincial Child Care Office.

In 1981, the YWCA Board supported the four recommendations chosen by the Coalition on Day Care, of which the YWCA is a member, as priority concerns from the United Way Day Care study and those were: that family and group day care and Lunch-and-After-School programs must be expanded under the Provincial Day Care Program to ensure that all children requiring service receive care in a safe, supportive and stimulating environment; that a Day Care Act must be passed to set and provide for the enforcement of provincial standards for programming, staffing, nutrition and space; that all family and group day care and Lunch-and-After School programs must be licensed and a subsidy available to parents using these programs; and that provincial funding must ensure adequate staff salaries and programs and more equitable sharing of costs between the parents and the province.

In October of 1981, a letter was sent to the Provincial Government supporting provision of adequate day care and establishment of a Day Care Act.

We urge that the regulations referred to in Bill 21 will reflect the concerns which have been itemized and to this end the YWCA will look forward to continued input.

I thank you for this opportunity to present the YWCA position on day care services.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much Ms Cordes. Are there any questions to Ms Cordes?

**MS G. CORDES:** If there are no questions, I just have a couple. I understand that there will be hearings during the summer months to provide public input into the formulation of regulations and I just wondered if he had some time frame.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Evans.

**HON. L. EVANS:** We haven't got a specific time frame but we will be in communication with various organizations and groups, including yours, to advise you. We'd like to be as expeditious as possible but I don't like to pin myself down right at the moment to say exactly the week or the day that we can begin but we do wish to proceed expeditiously and my Legislative Assistant, Miss Phillips, will be very much involved in that as well. So we'll make every effort we can to communicate with you and other organizations. I just want to assure you we want to do it as expeditiously as possible.

**MS G. CORDES:** Could I just put forward that I note that there wasn't much time to look at the printed bill. It only recently was available in printed form and perhaps what proposed regulations do come forward, if we might have a little bit more advance time in order to see them in printed form, and also the suggestion has been made to me that if these hearings are provided over the summer months, it would be helpful for those of us who are looking after our children during the summer holidays, perhaps it might be possible to have

a day care, child-care setup arranged here for those of us to be able to utilize, to speak to the development of these regulations.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, I should point out to the delegate that we wouldn't necessarily have hearings here. They will not be of that type. We will not be this formal. We intend to go throughout the province to the community, to the people, rather than having formal hearings here as such, and meeting maybe with one group at a time rather than with all groups at one time.

All I'm saying is there are various combinations of doing this. It may be that when we go to one particular centre, we may talk to several groups at one time or one part of the city, it depends. But we'll certainly give you lots of notice and, if possible, give you as much information in advance so that you can read and peruse.

**MS G. CORDES:** Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Ms Cordes. Aleda Turnbull, please.

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** Thank you very much, Mr. Scott. I have a couple of pieces of printed material that I would like to circulate before I begin. Would you do that?

The printed material that we are circulating is a paper entitled "Standards in Day Care" and this is the agreement that the Coalition has come to through a very long process of community consultation with the day care community, with parents, with teachers and so on. We have been working on coming to this agreement since we began the United Way hearings. We have had many, many community meetings and ironed out a great number of the details in these. We'd like you to consider them very seriously as they do represent a consensus of the opinion in the community about this matter.

The second piece of material that I have provided for you is a list of those organizations in the community who have endorsed the standards that we are proposing. As you'll see from reading that list, it is fairly extensive and represents really a very broad cross section of Manitobans.

I would like to start then with some introductory remarks. To begin with, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to address you today. I, along with other community people, have been working for many years in order to come before you to offer our comments and our remarks and our support and our criticisms of the proposed community child day care Act. This is an important day for the citizens of Manitoba, for the parents and the children who are in day care, for the day care workers who have developed the present day care system in this province. We appreciate this opportunity to come to you.

I am speaking today on behalf of the Coalition for Day Care. This Coalition was formed in the spring of 1979 to lobby for the implementation of the United Way Report recommendations. The United Way Report on Day Care was first published in the fall of 1978 and it came about as a result of the appointing of a commission by the United Way in the spring of 1977. Fol-



lowing the appointment of the commission, there were extensive community hearings where parents, boards of day cares, citizens, medical people, trade unions came to the United Way Commission and expressed their concerns about the day care system in the province and suggested methods of improving and extending that system.

So we went through this whole process of the commission. We came to a consensus there and, in that report, there were 67 recommendations. To date, I believe it's three of those recommendations have been acted on. So the governments haven't really been moving awfully quickly to resolve this problem, but we are pleased that we now have a day care standards Act. This is certainly another recommendation of the report and we'll deal with a number of substantive issues that were discussed in the United Way Report.

I would like to tell you a little bit about the United Way commission, just to establish the level of community input and concern about this. The United Way established a broadly based community committee in which approximately 65 organizations were represented and this committee appointed the commission and oversaw the work of the commission and received the report at the end of that process. The attempt there was to establish the middle ground and to work that out very carefully and that's exactly what the commission did. The report was very warmly received by this large representative group, which had concerns about child care in our community. After the report was finished and the United Way received it and so on, it was felt that it was going to be necessary to continue the lobbying effort and, as a result of that, the organization that I speak for was formed. So it has been a very broad participatory process which has brought these commendations to you today and I would ask that you consider them seriously.

I would like to proceed then, to go through a number of what I see as the background and pertinent issues in the field of day care. I would first like to draw your attention to the fact that there are presently 20,000 children, pre-schoolers, in paid care in the Province of Manitoba. We currently have somewhere between 6,000 and 7,000 full-time licensed subsidized spaces in the province. In my understanding of the estimates for this year, we would have somewhere under 1,000 new spaces. So, we are looking at around 7,500 full-time spaces in the province and around 20,000 children in full-time paid care in the province. That means that we're basically running a system on the taxpayers' dollar which delivers service to about one-third of the people who are paying for this kind of care in the community.

We feel that this is a very unjust situation because there is no basis for establishing who should be in the licensed, supervised child care system and who is out of the licensed, supervised child care system and who is out of the licensed supervised child care system.

Other than first come, first served and older children, it really is very similar to running a school system at public expense and saying that only one-third of the children of the province may go to that system and that the basis on which the children may go to this publicly funded system is whether they happen to live close to a school; whether they happen to be involved

in organizing a school; whether they're in the remote areas of the province or I would suggest with regard to the situation with infant care, whether or not their children are the most needing of schooling or not. It really is a very unfair, unjust system that we currently have.

The University of Saskatchewan, in Regina, did a study, a statistical study, on day care needs and use in the Province of Saskatchewan. They have fewer spaces than us, but there is no reason to believe that the situation isn't parallel. They've got about a quarter of their children in licensed subsidized spaces as opposed to a third. What this study group found was that some families were paying up to 40 percent of their total income for day care. Now, these are people who are struggling to stay in the work force, who are generally earning minimum wage and who support the core values of our society and are doing it with great difficulty. I would suggest to you that this is really a concern for the government, that there are mainly women in our community who are working with one or two children and paying for them themselves, because they can't get into the licensed subsidized system, and they're paying up to 40 percent of their income for this service. We really feel that this is an issue that needs to be rectified in the very near future. We seem to have a lot of money in this province for capital expenditures and various other things which have been prioritized as more important than the care of our young children, and I really wonder at a system that supports bridges and highways and so on over the needs of young children. We know that numbers of these young children who are in the unlicensed system are getting very poor care.

One of the reasons that the Manitoba Teachers' Society has endorsed the Coalition is that they are receiving these children into the school system, and are understanding very clearly the problems which arise from children who spend their first five or six years in unstimulating unsafe environments, and the expense is being transferred to the school system and those are only in situations in which critical issues have not arisen about the actual safety of children.

I don't like to present a lot of anecdotal evidence, but I think the legislators really need to know some of the situations that have arisen as a result of this unlicensed system. The demand for day care is so high and the provision of it is so inadequate that in the community that I work in, St. Boniface, in one year we had two day cares being closed down by the City of Winnipeg under the Public Health Regulations. One of those day cares had 25 children and one lady running the day care. The kids were in the basement with the television. The other one had around 20 children and the kids were being locked outside in the cold, fall weather. This is how the authorities became aware of this because the neighbours phoned in because they couldn't tolerate observing this situation anymore. So that there are children out there right now, today, this morning, who are being badly cared for as a result of the lack of prioritizing of services for the 13,000 children who are cared for outside of their families in unlicensed, unsupervised settings where the staff ratios in some instances are absolutely ridiculous; are detrimental to the health and the emotional development of children. Something really needs to be done

about that.

The second general issue that I would like to raise for you is that the children in our community who are most vulnerable, who are not even old enough to speak and tell their parents about the kind of care they are receiving, that is, the infants to two-year-olds are the ones who are mostly in the unlicensed settings. There are under 100 places for zero to two-year old children in the province, so that the majority of these kids, and you know no one has accurate statistics on how many there are, but one would estimate that there are 6,000 to 7,000 of them in these unlicensed settings. Now we know from child development people who have studied this for numbers of years, from medical people, that the first two years of life are absolutely crucial in one's emotional, intellectual and even physical development. Yet these are the children that we are exposing to these unregulated, unsupervised settings and this is obviously not in the public interest. It, in fact, amounts to a scandal that our community is allowing this to continue.

The group day care centres in our province cannot really provide infant day care because of the per-diem rate which is set up to accommodate the staff ratios for children who are two-and-a-half to six. Some of them are providing small numbers of spaces, mainly by taking money out of their other programs and impoverishing that even more. But this situation, you know, simply is not tolerable and I don't see any monies in the current Estimates even to do anything about this. I really would suggest to you that this is something that really must be looked into.

The third issue relating to accessibility in day care is that Native children in our province living on reserves have no access to day care whatsoever. In other words, our policy is absolutely discriminatory on the basis of race and residence. The reason for this, of course, is the split jurisdiction in social services between the province and the Federal Government and nothing has been done to rectify this situation. We know that on the reserves in our provinces we have a very high child population as opposed to adults. In the community generally, there are about 35 percent of the population are under 19. On many reserves we're looking at a ratio that is closer to 67 or 70 percent of the population under the age of 19. These are Stats Canada figures. Many of these children are parents; many teenagers are parents, and these people need support. If the kind of economic development policies that both governments have made some attempt to put onto reserves are going to have to have any effect whatsoever, there has to be an adequate family support system so that people can participate in the economy.

Many, many families on reserves find themselves going in and out of jobs because of poor day care arrangements. I am employed by a Children's Aid Society which, until very recently, has been working on a couple of reserves, and the need for day care really has been one of the most pressing child welfare issues. Now it is against the public interest and it is against the development of family life which supports the kind of personality development so that people can participate in the economy when they grow up to be in these very unstable kind of arrangements on a daily basis. Yet the very people who need family sup-

port the most are getting absolutely nothing. There are provisions under The Child Welfare Act which says a child welfare agency or the province may place children in day care but because there are no licensed centres on reserves, it can't be affected because the provincial Government has said that this provision may only be used when there is a licensed facility available, and there are no licensed facilities available so we have a Catch-22 situation. I would suggest to the legislators that you really need to look into this issue. You know, I'm sure a class action suit could be brought under the new constitution on the basis of discrimination on the basis of race with regard to this situation. It's not something that hasn't been pointed out before to elected people, but it would be much better for the province to move now, rather than after its been enjoined to do so by a court.

The third general issue that I'd like to address is that trained day care workers in the province, because of the per-diem rate, generally earn from \$150 to \$250 less per month than other Community College graduates. These people are doing a two-year Community College course and, by and large, they are sacrificing at that level every month to be involved in this system, to be child care workers. We are treating these people whose job requires dedication, skill, emotional maturity, physical strength and knowledge of children's educational, artistic and developmental needs. This is the way we're paying them.

This situation generally means that people who are untrained are working at minimum wage, and as a result of this, there is a very high staff turnover. This affects moral in centres badly, and that affects the children. These children need stability in their lives and yet we are structuring the economics of the day care system in such a way to get the maximum instability. I suggest to you that is not in the public interest; it's not in the interest of the children, their parents or the citizens of tomorrow. When we're looking at 20,000 children being in this system, it's not a minor social issue; it's a major social issue and one that must be addressed.

Another training issue is that there is currently no training for day care workers outside of the City of Winnipeg. This has meant that while the system in Winnipeg has developed not badly in terms of trained staff, that the situation in the rural areas really, that there's a dearth of trained workers. There are a lot of dedicated workers and many of the directors in rural areas have training and the system is doing the best it can, but as we push for standards in this area, we have to have accessibility to training resources for the workers, so that there can be some ability of these people to give the kind of service that they want, that the children need and that the parents desire.

The final issue that I'd like to discuss, is around profit-taking day care in the province. The government, since the inception of the program, has allowed profit-taking day cares in the province. There has been continued concern about the quality of care provided in some profit-taking centres. This has been expressed by parents, by educators, by medical people, child development people who see these children and yet, we continue to have profit-taking day care.

I would bring to your attention that Great West Life has recent announced that it is withdrawing its sup-

port from Kindercare Mini-Skool on the basis of public relations issues that it discussed in the press. I would urge that the legislators review this situation and come to a decision about it. We feel that there are concerns about profit-taking day care in our community. I would point out to you, that we do not have profit-taking public services in other sectors. We do not have profit-taking schools. We have private schools but we have no profit-taking schools below the 18-year-old student level.

We don't have profit-taking hospitals. This has been defined as not in the public interest, it is not the Canadian way. Yet for those citizens of our province who are most vulnerable and for the social need which is really very desperate in many situations because parents find themselves having to choose between a day care that they may not be happy with and losing their job, losing the economic basis of their family, we are encouraging a kind of development that we encourage in no other area of our economy, and I would ask you to seriously consider the implications of these facts.

Those are my general remarks. I'd like now to address some remarks to the issue of the standards that we recommend to you. I believe that these would relate generally to Section 33 in the Act and as is the common practice with legislation, many of these nitty-gritty issues are not addressed in the bill itself, but will be addressed in the regulations.

Firstly, group day care is any facility providing regular child care to five or more children with nonrelatives and excludes the facilities regulated by The Public Schools Act. Basically our recommendation there is that family day cares not be allowed to go above five children. The wisdom provided for the number of five is that we feel that there should be no more preschool children in a home than the good Lord would place in a home, and we all know that she has been very wise in this matter and so we shouldn't contravene her wisdom.

Family day care is child care provided in the home of a nonrelative on a regular basis as a business to children under 12, in other words, people who leave their kids with a neighbor one day a week and this is a reciprocal relationship or something like that, obviously are not in it as a business. Similarly before Lunch-and-After-School is an organized program for children from five to 12 where service is provided during these periods. The regulations should apply to group family day care and before-lunch and after-school programs.

As you know, we have currently had the situation where some programs have been regulated and the largest program, that is, a group day care program has not been regulated by the province, even though it has been paid for by the province, that is, within the City of Winnipeg.

We also feel that it is absolutely essential that some standards be built in with regard to staff qualifications. In reviewing this very difficult issue both for the United Way and within the Coalition, we have opted for what is basically called the mixed model. We felt that we're not currently ready to go into a completely professionalized model and that there is room in the day care system for people who have strength, energy, humour, imagination and love small children. But we

also feel that this is a service which needs persons in the position of director and in the position of room co-ordinator who have some training in terms of organizing and setting up programs to meet the developmental needs of children. The basic thing that is behind this is that we believe that we must have what is called a developmental day care system as opposed to a caretaker or custodial system, that a custodial system basically turns out children who are not school ready, who have developmental problems, may be even growth problems and one which certainly can't deal with some of the children who are having problems, as opposed just to the normal issues of growing up.

We feel that the program currently offered at Red River is a good program and should provide the basic standard for qualifications for these people throughout the province, but that there should be equivalency. Some of the university programs should also be interchangeable and probably there's a larger theoretical base there; they're probably better trained or more thoroughly trained, but the Red River course could provide the standard.

We also feel that there's a real need for administrative training within the day care community. Some of that is being done through Project Manage, which is a provincially-sponsored group currently, which is providing in service to managers. The community-based day care system that we have basically means that people out there who are running fairly small operations have to have a fairly good level of management skills in order to make the day-to-day decisions around money, staffing, staff relationships and so on, if the system is going to work.

We wouldn't support a system which had school principals having no academic background or no management training and these people are dealing with older children than the day care system deals with. So there is a real need for some basic training and courses in management skills, so that a lot of the problems which arise in day care centres just could be dealt with in a more effective manner and the budgets could be overviewed and it would just bring things up to a better level.

As we move into the whole issue of staff training we really need to look at, I suppose one should say, grandmothing clauses because that is, in this case, usually the issue. As the day care system has grown up, without any staff qualifications, there are many people who have been working in the system since 1974 who basically are providing good service and they need to have the opportunity to take courses, to have a challenge credit system to get their qualifications recognized. They have made a very significant contribution to the development of day care in this province and they need to be treated fairly and that really is a very important issue as this Bill is passed.

These courses also need to be accessible in the rural areas and in the Northern areas. There needs to be extension courses and the other aspect of this issue is that there needs to be monies built into the Budget for people who are on the job to do these courses in the day time. We are currently asking people to work very long days. The senior people often work more than eight hours a day and we're then asking them to take courses, sometimes 50 or 60 or

150 miles from their homes. Now this is very clearly a very discriminatory kind of situation and the educational facilities in the province really need to extend themselves to be helpful to these people.

We need to establish a licensing system so that there can be fairness established throughout the day cares in the province, and equivalency, so that as budgets are being reviewed and so on, that you can take a look at a centre and say, well, this centre has so and so many trained people and there are various steps of staff qualification; so that the Provincial Day Care Office can have some basis for making decisions about whether a day care centre should be licensed, or if there are problems in a centre, how it should be dealt with. Also, parents who are having to make decisions about where they're going to leave their children, have to be able to know what the qualifications are of the people where the children are left.

Currently, we're in the situation of you go and you may interview these people, you may talk to them but, unless you know an awful lot about child development and about the key words that are used in the area, you may be completely baffled by what you're told and not be able to make a responsible decision about where your child should be.

Then we go on to discuss the directors and the head teachers in each room should have qualifications.

The next important area of regulation that I'd like to look at is child-staff ratio and group size. There's been a great deal of discussion about this in the community and I think that the standards that we suggest on Page 2 basically represent the consensus of good thinking in the community about what is workable. There seems to be two components to the issue of staff-child ratio. One is how many teachers you have; and the second one is how large the group is. There is a certain point that more teachers won't improve the situation if you have too many children in the setting. I'm sure if any of you have ever been with large groups of children for any period of time you'll understand this issue. I don't think I want to go through those in detail. They are slightly lower than the City of Winnipeg current regulations and those that the province has used outside of the City of Winnipeg.

There is one point that has been missed from your copy of this, and that is, our recommendations is that in family day care there not be more than five children, including the parent's own children, who are under school age; and there not be more than two children under two. We feel that quality care cannot be delivered in those situations and, as I mentioned before, we have divine authority for this.

With regard to physical facilities, the spaces have to be large enough. There has to be a large room, a gym-like room where the children can play and can have gross motor activities, so that they have normal development. There needs to be sinks and wash-rooms for children. I guess, really the most crucial issue there is the issue of outdoor play space. Many, many day care centres have no regular access to outdoor play space.

We know that one of the causes of hyperactivity in children is lack of access to gross-motor activity; to running around and working steam off and yet, many of the day care centres in the City of Winnipeg do not have this facility. Children are taken in good weather

to the local parks, but this is a problem. Many parks are across very busy streets, so there is a safety issue. We, fortunately, haven't had a tragedy with regard to this, but you know, we do not have our public school students in church basements and they're only at school for five hours a day. Most day care children are in day care for at least nine hours a day and sometimes more, depending on the travelling time of the parents.

The reason for this difficulty is because there has never been any capital funding in the day care budget, nor has there been any agreement with the Department of Education, for unused classroom space. This has been negotiated in individual circumstances, but many school divisions have been punitive with day care centres in terms of the kind of rent they charge. Some of the highest rents that are paid by day care centres in the province are paid to school divisions for the use of empty classrooms. Other day care centres are being forced to use commercial space in shopping centres where there is no access to play space and these children, basically, are being deprived of access to the great outdoors, to God's gift to all of us, on a very regular basis. While we would have to move slowly to resolve this, it couldn't be done over the summer. We really believe that there has to be a capital funding built into the day care funding or we're going to be in the same situation 10 years from now that we are today.

The other issue there - and this is probably addressed again later on - is that we're not requiring in suburban developments, where many many of the day care needs currently are, we're not requiring that the developers build a day care centre as they're building the development. The Social Planning Council did a study just over a year ago on day care needs in the City of Winnipeg and they found the greatest need for day care was in the new suburbs, in Silver Heights, Waverly Heights, and so on. Those are precisely the areas where there are no public spaces available. The schools are jammed to the rafters; there are very few churches; the community clubs are extremely busy and often small; they're just in the development phase. And yet here, where all these children are, we haven't required the building of suitable spaces and we may have to look, as a result of that, at converting houses or some kind of makeshift setup to deal with this problem as we get into it, and it really would not be a very difficult problem. I submit to you that in the City of Winnipeg, an amendment to The City of Winnipeg Act which required developers to provide suitable child care space in new developments, would deal with this problem in a very equitable way.

I also believe that developers given some encouragement would be more than happy to build day care centres in new developments. Given the housing market these days, I'm sure they would do that instantly. It certainly would be a drawing card for young families into their development.

Another issue of importance - I'm now on Page 3 - is nutrition. Because of the funding arrangements that have been set up, while there are some regulations at the city level about nutrition, basically most of the day care centres do not meet those regulations so that we have children who are spending 50 weeks of the year eating bag lunches. Now, that may be good training for eating the way some of us do now, but we know

that it's not very healthy and we know that these children's nutritional patterns are being set up at this time and we know that eating bag lunches is not particularly nutritious. Yet we are teaching and training our children that the main meal of their day should be sandwiches. I suggest to you that that's not a particularly good thing for us to be doing.

Another extremely important area is that there needs to be oversight and public input into the issue of programming. There is currently no really significant overview of programming, and we believe that each day care centre should be able to articulate for the parents and for the day care office what kind of a program it is delivering. That should be verifiable and the co-ordinators from the day care office should be going out and making sure that people are using the program that they say they're using.

If we walk into any public school in this province, we know what's going to be going on more or less in Grade 1 and more or less in Grade 2, but we haven't built that kind of expectation into our day care system. Now, that's not to say that everyone should be looking at the same picture book at the same time in the province, but it is saying that we have a fairly good idea about the developmental, the emotional, the physical and the artistic needs of children and that we should be requiring day care centres who are providing service to meet these needs and they should be answerable on the issue of programming in a public way.

We also believe that there should be adequate before Lunch-and-After-School programs. There are currently a few programs in the City of Winnipeg and a very small number outside, but many many children are not being cared for for significant parts of the day. It is an offence under The Child Welfare Act to leave children under 12 unattended for any unreasonable length of time and yet we are expecting parents to go to work and we're not helping them meet this need.

One of the most moving presentations that was made to the United Way Commission was by some parent at Shaughnessy Heights who are basically saying, we want to be in the work, we want to participate in the community, we want to contribute and we need some help to do that, because, you know, we've waited till our children are in school, but we need some support so that we know that we're not going to be getting calls from the police because the kids are running wild during the period before we get home and we really need your help to meet those needs. I think that if we, as a community, don't respond to that, then it really says something about our values and about the kind of problems we're going to be having with the young people in our community.

I'd like to go on to special needs. We don't really have a system within the day care setup currently for dealing with special needs in any kind of an organized fashion. There are a few programs which relate to handicapped children by developing special programs for them. There are many day care centres which have mildly handicapped children in their midst, and either none or not very much support for that.

We recommend that a system be developed for supporting day care centres to take handicapped children into their midst, that there be staff provided for them and that the specialized services that we

currently have in the city be used for assessment, support services and staff training rather than delivering programs which only deal with a handicap. The experience in the public school system has been very much that handicapped children tend to come up more to the level like other children, of the children whom they are with, so we don't really want more ghettoized programs in the province. There may be a need for a small number of specialized programs for very severely handicapped children, but we need to stop encouraging the development of programs which are based on a handicap, rather than on an age grouping or a developmental need. The programs who are accepting these children need funding and they need staff training support and they need assessment support in order to deliver the kind of service that we already know they can deliver with that kind of support.

Moving on to Page 4, family day care. This is really the most underfunded service of the whole day care set up in the province. That is where the majority of unlicensed settings are and where the greatest difficulty is. I mentioned to you before, two horror stories from the area where I work as a social worker and we believe that there should be sufficient licensed, subsidized family day care homes in the province so that we could create a market so that parents would have some choice as to where their children would be. We currently do not even have a market so that parents can decide if they want their children in a group, what kind of a group, or if they want them in a family setting. They really basically have to take what they can get.

If the family day care system is going to work, it has to be regulated as to the numbers of children who are there. There shouldn't be too many. There needs to be staff training for the family day care workers. They need to have access to the group day cares in their area in an organized fashion. We're basically suggesting that the staff training, the in-service training be delivered through the group day care centres, and that the family day cares in that area be allied with the group centres. If that kind of a model were built then all kinds of support to parents with young families could be given at practically no expense to the community and there should be toy lending libraries and all the other things which would facilitate parents helping one another in the community.

Finally, an issue around family day care is the wages paid to family day care workers. Our recommendation is that if five is considered to be a full house that that also be paid at the salary of a child care worker. So that you take the per diem for each child would then be one-fifth of a child care worker's salary. There should not be discrimination in wages between different kinds of child care workers. Moving on to salary guidelines, there needs to be a lot of work done as the standards for salaries are worked out in relating salaries to levels of qualification. Presently that is worked out at each and every day care centre, and seeing as how the funding is done on a per-diem rate, it basically means that if you are working in a centre which has a very high rent, you get lower wages than if you're working at one that has a low rent. This isn't really very equitable because the level of rent is really controlled by whether or not there are free public spaces or low-cost public spaces available in your community.

It's very arbitrary. The salaries need to be set in a different way than on the per diem and they need to relate to the qualifications and training of the staff if the issue of morale and keeping people in this profession is ever to be dealt with; similarly with family day care workers. We dealt with that previously.

The issue of funding, basically government funding has never been equal to the regulations that have been around. Poor as they have been, funding has not been adequate to meet them, so that we're asserting that there needs to be sufficient funding to meet the standards that are set. That seems to be a very basic point but it's not one that we've been successful in making until now. We're also suggesting that the basis of funding be changed from a per-diem setup to a line-item budget. Line-item budgets, as you know, are based on actual costs and reflect the real situation and don't penalize people because they can't get free rent or other things which put their costs out of whack. In a day care centre as you can understand, the main costs are salaries, food and rent. So there needs to be some justification process for that and some method of meeting individual situations, and we suggest that line-item budgeting would do this.

Also, as I mentioned earlier, there is a need for capital funding so that day care centres can be built where they are needed rather than people having to take their children long distances, sometimes on public transportation, or just not having facilities available in their neighbourhood and using very, very poor quality services. There needs to be capital funding available for conversion as well as for building.

The present program we're recommending with regard to subsidizing low income parents should be continued. We believe that the adequate funding to maintain basic quality of programs in each centre should be a provincial responsibility. We're also suggesting that beyond that, if the province isn't able immediately to move to a mass universal day care system which is, of course, what we would like that there be some prioritizing of needs. There never really has been any community prioritizing of needs. It's all been done on the basis of who organized a centre where and applied for a licence, and that has meant that there have been some anomalies of overservice in some areas and tremendous underservice in other areas. Fire and health standards need to be enforced, of course.

As we go on to organization, and board structure, group day care centres should be organized either as co-operatives or under The Companies Act or corporations; that the boards of these centres should be responsible; that ideally 50 percent of the board should be made up of parents; that parents should be notified of board meetings. All these issues are raised because of difficulties which have occurred in the past. There have been numbers of what are generally called 'sweetheart' boards, and the previous government moved to do something about this but there are still some difficulties. We certainly want to prevent the development of any more.

The regulation with regard to notification of parents of meetings and so arise from actual situations that have occurred. There is a lot of discussion about the necessity for staff to be represented on boards; our recommendation is only one in five. That may be too

low. We have lowered it to that level because of concerns that staff not be overrepresented on boards and not be hiring and firing themselves, but one of the most important things in a small operation like this is to have a good working relationship between the parents and the board. Otherwise the whole system gets into conflict so that staff involvement in one way or another on boards is very important.

Moving on to Page 6, enforcement. There are really two aspects to enforcement. One is that the current situation which is going to be rectified by the Act be dealt with, that is, that the province which is the funding level of government in the day care system also be the enforcing level. It is absolutely ludicrous to have a situation that we've had where the city was enforcing regulations for a provincially funded program.

We also feel that the day care office needs to play a dual role of supporting boards to meet their commitments to day care; that this is really the cornerstone of the system; that we have built a community-based system that we want boards to continue to be primarily responsible for all issues in centres, but that the day care office provides a backup service to this and ensures that it does occur in instances where boards are not functioning properly or where very severe problems have arisen. So we go through the steps that should be done by. Basically the day care office should be involved in consulting and advising with the centre. If that doesn't work, after having approached the board and the staff to try and help them work things out, and then telling them that things need to be worked out; if that still doesn't work then obviously you have to move to the next step which is imposing a probationary period and during the probationary period, I believe the Act says that there may be a provisional administrator appointed if that is seen as being appropriate. This is really the same sort of model as the public schools operate under and we support that.

Finally, there should be a receivership system which I see you have responded to, so that if day care centres got into really serious problems, the province could merely take them over, as opposed to phoning up 60 parents and telling them that they wouldn't be able to go to work tomorrow. We do have the kind of resources in this province where we could deal with those situations, if the day care office had the ability to respond to that. They currently don't have that.

Moving on to administrative issues; we really believe that the day care office needs to become more active in the community; that it has, basically been a receiver of applications for development of day care and it has helped people to organize that, but up-to-date, it has not been active in going into communities and helping people organize day care when they know that it's necessary. They need to be more involved in identifying, evaluating and supporting day care centres in areas of need.

Finally, we believe that the day care system in this province really has been begun fairly well; that what we want in this province is a community-based day care system; that we really want a tremendous amount of parental involvement in the system and that we want to be able to build from the day care system, services to all young families. We currently don't really have any resource base that relates to young

families that isn't problem oriented. The only way you can get help with young children is if your kid is really in trouble. We know that is ineffective and extremely expensive and yet we haven't really done anything about it.

We're suggesting that if we could move to a community-based day care model with the needs of nonworking parents being built in there as well, in terms of teaching about parent effectiveness and child development and so on, that we could deal with some of these issues at the time when they were low cost; at the time when something could be done about them, as opposed to waiting until they become severe difficulties, when in some instances, there's not a lot that can be done.

I'd like to thank you for your patience in listening to our views. We're fairly hopeful that we're beginning a process at this point of dealing with some of the basic issues in day care. We're not naive enough to think that this Act is a solution. It is a beginning of a process that will deal with some of the very important issues around the needs of young children in this province. We would like to thank you for addressing that and we will continue to be involved in working these issues out during the time that the Act is under consideration and after it is passed and in the years to come.

Thank you

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much, Mrs. Turnbull. Are there any comments?

Mr. Evans.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank, first of all, Mrs. Aleda Turnbull for a very thought and a very comprehensive presentation on the whole issue of day care and the development of standards in day care. It certainly contains a lot of good ideas and makes us all realize as we listen that there's a great deal more that we can do and must do. It can be a very complicated matter as well, attempting to implement certain standards to achieve an ideal. I think we should realize it becomes complicated by the fact that you sometimes have to realize that we deal with municipal zoning bylaws, in some cases, which sometimes in some communities inhibit the development of family day care centres.

Also, we find that although the Federal Government is prepared to fund on a 50-50 basis, right now this year in the Province of Manitoba, we don't get 50-50 funding because our standards already exceed the federal guidelines. The feds at the present time are really contributing only 40 percent to our total expenditures.

Which brings me to a couple of questions that I'd like to ask Mrs. Turnbull. As she indicated, the key is the funding, the amount of money that we have available because we can write into the regulations all the standards in the world, but if we don't have the money to back up our requests for standards, it's, therefore, a meaningless exercise. This past year, we increased our budget of roughly a third from \$9 million to \$12 million for day care and certainly to implement higher standards will take considerably more funds.

I'd like to ask, therefore, a couple of questions relating to the acquiring of funding. You mentioned the ideal type of funding would be line-by-line, non-profit

organizations. I gather what you're suggesting is an approach similar to the nonprofit personal care homes, for example, where we look at their budget and decide on the adequacy of the budget as opposed to the profit-making personal care homes where there is a per diem struck and we pay out on a per-diem basis.

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** Yes, mainly because of the problems which have arisen around such widely differing costs for things like rent and heat and so on.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Well, given the fact that we have a system of charging a per-diem rate in day care - I say that, having realized your position on line-by-line funding, you know, but putting that aside - do you support the present setting of rates on an ability-to-pay basis? We have an ability-to-pay basis in effect with a maximum ceiling on the amount of rate that any day care centre operator can charge.

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** Well, I don't think that there's any rationale for providing services to children over six free in a public school system and charging the parents of younger children. I understand that this is a political reality that many people in the community feel there should be a per diem charged to parents and that be charged on a per-diem rate as opposed to through the taxation system. So, that we're prepared to go along with the practicality of the ability-to-pay issue, that it's a practical necessity. If you went to line-item budgeting, obviously, you'd have to set a per diem and then rationalize the budget that the per diem is paid by the parents who were over the qualifying income. That would have to set by the day care office on an annual basis or a semi-annual basis.

We can't have every parent going through the line-item budget and saying whether they agree with it or not. We could, but it would be rather cumbersome.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Just one more related question. At the present time, the system we have provides, in effect, a price-control situation where there is a limit. It was 8.50, it's now 9.50 per day in one category. In other words, whether you're subsidized or not as an operator, you cannot charge beyond that limit. This is a constraint and there was some rationale for that, but would you support the lifting of a maximum level or a limit, but again assuming it's based on an ability-to-basis. What I'm getting at is ways and means of obtaining some more funding to improve the standards of the day care system.

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** It seems to me that the reason for putting the maximum limit on the fees charged, was that everybody should be charged the same amount and the government should subsidize low-income people because we didn't want to encourage the development of a ghettoized day care system; we didn't want to have day care centres in certain areas whose standards other people couldn't meet because of the affluence of various communities; that we wanted to have an acceptable standard, and we wanted to have everyone meeting that. The day care community supports that concept. The whole issue of extra billing, which is maybe what your saying, of

course is very contentious in a number of areas. I don't see that it would contribute enough money to justify the problems, basically, is my answer. You know, well-to-do parents are currently being charged in many instances \$9.50 per child per day which is a substantial cost, and the public is putting in, currently, a little over \$2.00.

So, I believe, there needs to be public input into each and every public day care centre because, I believe, that is the only way we can really effectively deal with the issue of standards. But I think the government needs to set the per diem and needs to subsidize; so we support basically, the present setup, except we'd like to see the budgets handled differently.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Just a clarification then. No, I wasn't proposing that we would depart substantially from the present system which is based on an ability-to-pay, and where we provide regardless, even if you are a well-to-do parent and can afford pay the full amount, \$9.50 therefore, without any subsidy, we still do and would continue to pay maintenance grants, you know, general funding to all centres for the purposes of ensuring standards being achieved, etc. So, what I'm talking about is a modification really, and I don't know how serious a modification it might end up being if this were to be put into place. But again, on the basis of ability-to-pay, let's say X-percent of spaces could be levied at a rate above a standard rate. In other words, you wouldn't have a \$9.50 cap, the \$9.50 ceiling would be raised for X-percent of the spaces, again for the very well-to-do people.

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** That, in many ways, is both a technical question and a question of values. In order to answer that very completely I'd really have to know the income levels. If it's not going to yield very much money it's not worth the other parts. I think generally, we would not be excited over that; I don't know if it's a great issue though. That's not a terribly definite answer. I'd really need more information before I could . . .

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you very much, Mrs. Turnbull. I can't give you any more information on that because we don't have it, and it would require quite a bit of research, I suppose. I'm just looking at ways and means of getting as many dollars as we can.

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** I guess my reluctance or feeling about it is that currently we're looking at about 50 percent of the families being subsidized in the day care system, so that I'm not sure that such a special tax would benefit very much. Then there are the other issues of does it go into the general day care fund or does it go into the Tuxedo day care or whichever one is charging it, you know. So, if we do that, then we create a differential day care system in the province where some centres have more money than other centres which is exactly what the line item budget system would be designed to get away from. It could be cumbersome and not yield very much money.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, my Legislative Assistant, Ms Phillips, I believe, has some questions as well. Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you very much, Aleda, you gave us a lot of food for thought. In fact, I was sitting while you were talking, wishing that our Minister of Finance was on this particular committee, because a lot of the issues that you raise, of course, are things that ideally we would like to be able to do right away but, of course, with financial considerations it's most difficult. But in terms of the specific provisions that we've put in the Act, saying that the kind of goals that you've laid out are the kinds of goals we want to work toward.

I have some specific questions. I've talked to a lot of different groups over the last six months and also listened to the debate in the House on Second Reading and there are some issues that you raise that I'd like some clarification on. For instance, one of them is to do with central salary guidelines, and one of the issues that has been raised, in terms of community control, meaning the control that parent boards have in several areas, I'd like to address starting with salary guidelines. If, in fact, we are leaving the responsibility for the operation of the centre, the day-to-day operation of the centre and setting up the kind of centre that the parents communally have decided that they want for their children, is it feasible then to say that centrally, as government, through the day care office or through regulations or whatever, that we should set the level of salaries throughout the province?

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** I guess that we have a precedent for this, you know, during the 30s, 40s and 50s, we had a school system in which many of the teachers in the province were paid wages which didn't allow them to continue to work there; and the province, in the late 50s, set up a system of financing which was based on salary levels and qualifications, and boards were given certain amounts of monies to pay to certain qualified staff people. As a result of that, the standards of education in the province rose dramatically; and the ability of the teaching profession to hold qualified people throughout the province rose dramatically; and school boards have lots of authority still. I think the issue with day care centres is that they are even smaller units than school system. Because of that, you know, it's very difficult for staff associations or unions to really represent the interests of the staff because you have bargaining units that are four or five people. You know, given that kind of a situation, it seems to me that the province needs to assume some responsibility as it did with teachers who were less in need of that kind of help from the Provincial Government because they were organized and they were in large bargaining units by the Manitoba Teachers' Society.

I suggest that unless the province takes some leadership in this issue that very little will happen, and this situation will continue, as it did in the 40s and 50s with the school system, until the Provincial Government said, this is not in the public interest and very wisely did something about it. I don't see that as a contravention of local autonomy or anything else. It's merely saying what the funding base is.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Ms Phillips.



**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you. Also on that, when you spoke of programming, again the concern was local autonomy and the "fear" that the government through the day care office and the co-ordinators, as an example, would go into a centre and determine what kind of program had to take place. We have a lot of centres that have developed in the province with a specific philosophy, whether they be run by religious groups, or whether they be run by groups that have a certain environmental health food concern or whatever, or a certain co-operative philosophy. The concern that has been expressed is that we will come in and lay on a specific program that will then make it redundant to have a parent board that says; but this is the way we want our day care centre to be, and these are the kinds of values we want to instill in our children. So what is the point of having a day care board made up of parents or community members if we are going to determine the program?

I particularly don't see that the kind of suggestions you have made in terms of programming and the kind of ideas that we've been formulating for regulations on programming preclude that. I say, if you're talking about gross motor skills in a certain amount of time, or if you're talking about a certain amount of time for outdoor play or for artistic development or language development or physical development, the two are exclusive. One can put the value system on top of the requirements for a quality program. I am not a trained early childhood development person, but I wonder from your experience, particularly dealing with the United Way Day Care Study, and the comments on programming that were made there and through your Association, can you give me a little bit more information, if you've discussed that issue, the contradiction whether it be there or not in that area?

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** Yes, there is discussion of it, and I think that the consensus is that many group day cares in the province currently offer a good level of program, but that's not because there's been any standards that they have been held to; it is because of their professionalism and the commitment of their boards. I guess what we are saying that each and every day care centre in the province should be meeting a basic minimum standard of service in the program area, and that one should be able to walk into any day care centre in the province, or any family day care home in the province, and be assured that the developmental, artistic, physical, emotional needs of these children are being met. If we're going to have a public program that has to be the case. Now there's no quarrel in the community about there being variation in this, just as there is a fair amount of variation within the public school system there could be even more variation within the day care system because people do have strong feelings based on religious ideas, or whatever, about how small children should be handled.

As long as those are meeting the basic developmental needs of the children, I submit to you that no competent day care operator is really going to complain about being required and funded to meet good standards. Now, it's going to require sensitivity on the part of the day care office, just as it has required sensitivity on the part of the Department of Education, those two principles of local autonomy and responsi-

bility have to be handled with tact and professionalism and imagination, and the responsibility needs to be left with the boards, but the responsibility has to be met. There is not a controversy in the community about requiring that the basic developmental needs of children be met in a public program. I don't think you're going to get anyone who is seriously going to argue against the basic developmental needs of children being met.

**MSM. PHILLIPS:** Thank you. I think most of the areas in your brief I think we're on-track with in a gradualized delivery, but the other area where there certainly is a difference is your recommendation that family day care homes be limited to five. In our program, at this point, the number is eight in the regulations that we have that deal with subsidized family day care homes. My information is that seems to be working quite well, and the provision that we have in the Act for larger numbers would also require that there be child staff ratio in the group family day care homes that we have in the Act. Do you not see that as workable?

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** Well, I think one could work a group family day care home where there is, in effect, the operator and a staff person. I do have concerns about more than five preschool children, including the parents own. I think that there is a real concern about the developmental needs of children being met. One of the difficulties that advocacy groups like ourselves have had is that we have had to rely on anecdotal evidence to look at issues.

I don't know what advice you've had on eight children in a family day care home; I don't know if those children have been reviewed by the Child Development Clinic, if we have any reading on whether their developmental needs are being met. It is my understanding that sort of thing hasn't been done. In the public school system there is a systematic review process in place which looks at all the schools in the province and finds out how they're doing with the job that they have been given. I would suggest that in the day care system that we really need to build that in. I don't know how your people could tell you, with any certainty, that it was working because of my understanding of the kind of access to information they have.

One might access that the children appeared to be happy when one was there, but I don't know anything more that I could say about it. I think that one would really need to build in some kind of method of determining if their needs were being met. I don't know how one person could work with eight children and meet their developmental needs. Most of us find it a full-time job to deal with two or three.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Yes, on that, I presume that in your personal work that you've had a fair amount of contact, although I find that our day care office, in terms of licencing family day care, put the applicants through quite a rigorous interview and inspection in terms of their quality to offer that service, and I guess what we can consider would be to look at the regulations and watch how that works, and certainly discuss it further over the summer as we're developing the regulations.

Also, from all our discussions, when we have

included the family's own children it seems that in a lot of cases, where the family's own children are just there, say, at lunch and after school, and they have less than say five other children to take care of during the day, that we felt that flexibility was necessary if they had two of their own coming home for lunch and they had three or four other people's children that they were caring for, that flexibility was necessary. Do you see that as a problem situation?

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** Well, I think it needs to be assessed.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** It might not be there all day.

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** It depends; if the family has six of their own children coming home or whether they have one and it depends how often the ratio is not applied, like how many hours of the day; if for half an hour there are too many children as opposed to four hours. I think that there can be some flexibility and some sensibleness used in the application of this kind of rule, but I think that we have to be careful about structuring and allowing poor service by regulation. I think that we do a disservice when we do that.

It also depends on the ages of the children. You know, this business about two under two, I think we know pretty well that nobody can look after more than two babies if they have other responsibilities, and meet the developmental needs of those children. So you may have very quiet, passive babies, but you're going to have problems when those kids get to school.

So, it does depend on all those factors in the mix. Yes, we do have concerns about things getting too many.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Okay, I just have one more question. In terms of staff training and sharing of equipment between family day care homes and group centres in the neighbourhood, there have been some concerns brought to me about that and again, possibly one of the answers is the funding dilemma. Most group centres say that they can hardly deliver the program that they have at present, let alone be a resource centre to half a dozen family centres in the neighbourhood and to expect them to supply that service for free or even for a nominal charge is really placing an unfair burden on group centres that are there in the community to provide quality care for the children in their custody.

So my question is, do you have any other alternatives or do you think that through a funding arrangement, that could be solved? That is a real concern for some group centres in areas.

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** Well, I know that one of the problems that many centres have is that they're too small and they're lacking the economies of scale. I really think that a lot of these things can be dealt with if there was some attention paid to integrating pre-school programs with nursery programs and with Lunch-and-After-School programs which provide certain natural periods during the day when there isn't so much activity, when some of this other programming could be done. For example, if you had a day care integrated with a nursery program, you could

have the program for the family day care mothers in the morning before the nursery kids came in, so that the people could be running an educational program or working with the family day care people in the morning with the nursery school kids in the afternoon and helping out with the lunch and after-four kids later. You begin to get some flexibility as you get a slightly larger operation.

With the line-item budgeting, there also would be opportunities, of course, to justify full positions or half positions. You might have a child development trainer who worked with two or three different day care centres. On Monday, they'd be in such and such a centre and Tuesday and Thursday and so on. It could be worked out, but it would have to be done through a different kind of funding setup.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Filmon.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask Mrs. Turnbull a brief question or two. I'll preface my questions, if I may, by indicating that the members of the Opposition have said in second reading and perhaps, Mrs. Turnbull has already read some of the debates in Hansard, that we certainly support the principle of this legislation and are, indeed, supportive of the government's intent to bring higher standards and to assure better quality of day care in the province.

The comments and remarks that have been put on the record, of course, our concern that virtually everything in terms of the actual detail rests with the regulations that are yet to be developed and adopted, and our concerns are that those regulations ought not to be developed in such a way that they are so narrow and restrictive as to eliminate the legitimate operations that are in existence today and are providing quality day care and serving the needs of the children, the parents and the communities as well; that they ought not to be because of failure to acknowledge community resource and opportunity differences in the various areas of the province, failure to acknowledge the role and the input of community boards on the operations and so on; that these ought not to be eliminated.

One area specifically that I wanted to ask and if I have not interpreted your remarks, I hope that you'll correct me. You have suggested that the group you represent is totally opposed to any - as you termed it, I believe - profit-taking organizations being involved in the provision of day care in the province in future. I can certainly accept the need to set and ensure by legislation and regulations that adequate standards and guidelines and regulations exist to ensure that everybody meets at least some level of standards that we, all of us agree to as being in the interests of the children, the parents and the community at large in day care. If any group that was a private organization that was organized in a manner that it was a private corporation that did, indeed, give a return on investment to whoever the investors were and they met all of those standards, on what basis would you be opposed to them continuing to operate in the field?

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** Well, I guess one of the concerns is a technical issue and that is that the way the day care program has operated in the province and the way we are recommending that it continue to operate, parents have a great influence through their boards. The fact of the matter is, that many of the profit-taking daycares that we have in the province do not have local parent boards. They are, in fact, international corporations, so that there is no access. The regulation and the enforcement of the standard is really done a great deal through the parents being knowledgeable of what is necessary and having access to regular meetings to iron out staffing issues; to help iron out educational methods; issues to help iron out methods of child management and all these things. These parents have no access and their option is to either take the kid or not take the kid there and when only a third of the spaces are in the licensed sector, they really don't have a choice. So that is the technical basis of our concern.

You know, I also raised the issue of whether governments wanted to develop profit-taking industry in this sector or not. It is a public issue as to whether they wish to do that or not. I raised it in that context as well. I have certain opinions about that. They are my opinions and the group I'm with also have opinions, but there are also these broader issues about whether or not there really can be that kind of input. If we don't have that, we then have to rely on masses of government inspectors, and I don't think we want to go to that. I think it's very expensive and it's probably fairly ineffective. The problem is that the people who are receiving this service, namely, the children, are not either legally or in any other way able to complain about the service. So, it's not an Eaton's and The Bay kind of competitive situation.

Those are basically my general concerns about it.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, again on the same topic, Mrs. Turnbull, assuming that a day care institution which was owned by a private corporation could meet all of the various standards that your group believed should be set for staff qualification; for child-staff ratios; for physical facilities; for special needs; for programs; for salary guidelines; fire safety; health standard, etc., and assuming that they could set up a parent liaison committee that will allow for input to the management of the centre, assuming that they could meet all of those things and, in fact, provide a mechanism for parent input into all of the concerns; and knowing that the ultimate restriction or the ultimate consequence of their not responding to the parents' concerns about their children would be that the parents withdraw their children from the institution and they fold up as a result. Knowing that very powerful situation would exist, what other concern could you have for not having them in the field?

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** If we did have a market situation in day care, the market argument could operate, but we don't. We have a forced access situation in the market currently in that there are so many fewer spaces than there is need.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Looking at the possibility that there might be a requirement for massive government

spending and in terms of capital investment to provide additional spaces, and the Member for Wolseley has alluded to the fact that by referring to the Minister of Finance that there obviously in any government including her government is a difference of opinion as to where the capital spending, where the money can come from and where it can go in any given set of circumstances.

Were there private investors who were willing to put up the capital and save the government of putting forth that capital and could meet all of these requirements, and could provide a service, I am at a loss to understand why, if you have the ultimate power of regulation to ensure that they meet to every last detail all of the standards and, in fact, exceed them, why you would want to restrict them from being there. We have plenty of parallels available even though they may not be private profit-making. I am one that's not offended by the fact that a school such as St. John's Ravenscourt or Balmoral Hall exists even though it costs \$4,000 and I can neither afford to send my children, nor maybe is it a priority of mine. I'm not offended either philosophically or from envy or for any other motivation, that it exists and it saves me as a taxpayer from having to put forth the money.

If parents see a value in creating an institution or supporting an institution that gives more than the minimum standards, that allows for the flexibility of their children perhaps getting more than what they could get by going into the local community day care that provides the minimum standards as set out in the regulations that are going to be proclaimed and so on, I don't understand what could offend anyone else from that sort of situation.

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** Well, it's really a practical problem that we're having here. It seems to me that St. John's Ravenscourt and Balmoral Hall, which are not profit-taking schools, are set up on the basis of the issue of what they consider to be excellence or choice. We are dealing here with profit-taking however, rather than the development of excellence. I don't believe that international corporations are entering the market primarily to produce greater excellence. They state that they're entering the market because they see it as a business opportunity and I take them at their word.

So I think that we have two different situations here. I am saying that the Canadian people have basically said that there are certain areas in the economy where they believe in competition and free enterprise, and there are certain areas in the community where they believe in public input and that small children and other needy persons like sick people and so on, have generally been defined as those where there is a higher degree of responsibility and particularly when those individuals are not of age to be able to express their preference. So I don't know how to get around that. If you can help me, I'd be interested, but I don't know how to get around it.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Any investors who see it as a good business investment, obviously are assuming that they will not only fulfill all of the requirements of their consumers who are the people putting their children in the institution but, in fact, being an attractive alter

native to whatever else is in the marketplace. As long as they are providing a service that is in demand and that maybe in many cases able to be enhanced over what are minimum standards and attract people then, in fact, they will continue to be in business. If they don't then they won't, and it will not be an attractive investment.

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** If there is a market?

**MR. G. FILMON:** That is right, and if there isn't then there won't be a need for it. We are talking about the enhanced type of institution. I think that the Minister was trying to get at something and because I see Mrs. McCormick here, I'll utilize her institution as an example. If an institution such as the Health Sciences Centre wants to provide a day nursery setup that is set up in a manner that its costs of operations are higher than those of other day care facilities around, let's just assume - and these may not all be correct - that they want to provide day care with lower child staff ratios, they may want to pay their staff higher because of the market competition if they exist within the Health Sciences Centre complex, and the comparable salaries of workers in the complex dictate that they must pay more if they want to add nurses or early childhood development people to their staff to provide things that are not provided in other day care centres and all of this results in a higher per-child per-diem cost. Do you think that they should be restricted from operating because they have to charge more per child per day in order to provide all of those services?

**MRS. A. TURNBULL:** Well, should they be restricted from operating? No, they shouldn't be restricted from operating. They do have many of those problems which their board, the board at the hospital is resolving. I am not privy to this information, but there obviously are different kinds of day care centres in the province and some of them, like Health Sciences Centre, have offered infant care which we know is more expensive. They are attempting to resolve their funding issues and I am sure they will.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I am sure they will as long as there is flexibility within this kind of legislation to allow them to, but if we say that you cannot, under any circumstances, obtain more than so much per day, per child, and that is below their actual costs then they obviously have to reduce the level of service that they're providing or go out of business.

**MRS. G. TURNBULL:** I guess, basically, the standards that we recommended would deal with that problem. If those standards were in effect there would not be a problem. I think that, basically, the kind of salaries that Health Sciences has been paying, which are based on an equal pay for work of equal value formula has meant that their costs are higher. We are recommending that be the case in every day care centre in the province: that you not be penalized because the day care centre you're working in is in Thompson or in The Pas. We feel that this is the method that should be used to resolve this issue.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, but it

isn't just simply a matter of higher salaries; it's a matter of the higher level of infant care; it's a matter of perhaps lower child-staff ratios; of additional specialists coming on-staff and all of those things which may, or may not, be provided in other institutions that will result in some institutions having higher levels of cost for which, in some cases, parents may be willing to pay additional costs. I think the Minister is looking for an answer. I respect the fact that you may not want to answer that question.

**MRS. G. TURNBULL:** Well, you see we're trying to deal with that, too, through the line-item budget issue. There are day care centres in the City, for example, who have an awful lot of immigrant children who don't speak English and they need extra staffing in order to get these kids ready for school. They need to be able to put that into their budget, just as Health Sciences needs to be able to put their Infant Care Program into their budget.

The issue here I guess is, how shall the per diem, if we have a system of line-item budgeting and a per diem system working together, how shall those mesh?

We would favour a constant per diem and line-item budgeting to deal with these issues of flexibility, so that the government could then say to a day care centre like Knox, which has had waves of immigrant families, yes, you need two or three extra workers to teach these currently Vietnamese children English and to help them deal with some of the traumas of having been picked out of the ocean and brought to Canada. These kids are needy and have problems in getting settled down and you need some extra workers and we'll work that out in the line-item budget, but the per diems are the same throughout the province. That is our preference.

One of the reasons for that is, on a technical basis, I don't think that extra billing will yield very much money and I think it'll cause a lot of trouble. I'm sorry to be such a technocrat about this, but I'm afraid that is my penchant on this matter.

**MR. G. FILMON:** No further questions Mrs. Turnbull.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We only have another minute left or so, Mr. Kovnats, can you get your question in that quickly.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Probably unless, by leave, we can extend it because if it's not going to take too long and I think my colleague would like to ask a couple of questions also. I think I can start.

I'd like to thank Mrs. Turnbull for a very thorough, comprehensive and excellent presentation. I disagree with some of the things that have been presented, but I'm not going to get into debate with Mrs. Turnbull because I think she could probably turn me inside out with her knowledge on day care centres. I just wanted to get a couple of questions in and find out her views for my interest and to help me.

Concerning day care centres, it really doesn't matter to me whether a large corporation or private investors operate them, as long as they provide a service at no additional charge to the people of the Province of Manitoba. I'm not against them making a profit but I would just like to go to my area, in particular, and

maybe Mrs. Turnbull can give me some assistance.

We've had a very trying situation in our area concerning the closure of some of the schools - and I'm not bringing that up for debate. I think that the important thing is that there was some discussion a little earlier, Mrs. Turnbull made a presentation about how we've got to upgrade day care centres and maybe this Lunch-and-After-School programs, take them out of the church basements and put them onto a level equal to where they should be. Has there been anything done with the closures of schools, through the school boards - Mrs. Turnbull did say that school boards have a lot of authority still - has there been anything done with the school boards concerning, let's just talk about my area where there's a couple of schools that are available, or appear to be available, for converting them to day care centres. It doesn't matter to me who operates them, somebody who makes a profit or a group of parents. I've dealt with both; I've had quite an interest with the particular agencies in my area.

Can Mrs. Turnbull just give us some recommendations on the use of schools that have closed because of declining enrolment?

**MRS. G. TURNBULL:** Yes. In the St. Boniface area, there are various day care centres in schools in the older area, but not in Windsor Park-Southdale. There's a day care centre in Queen Elizabeth School and there's one in, it's either Provencher or one of those schools in that area. To my knowledge, there's not one in the Windsor Park-Southdale area.

Of course, the Southdale situation is the classic new suburb problem, in that you have lots of young families with lots of kids and the schools are jammed. The area where there's lots of school space is down in North St. Boniface; same school division and with the St. Boniface Division one of the difficulties has been in working out more than yearly contracts, even in schools where there is lots of space, it basically has been a yearly contract. My understanding is that it creates a certain amount of instability and if you're having to have these people move that much, it creates problems.

Winnipeg Division, I believe, has come to an agreement with the Noon and After School people about rents and so on, after a great deal of negotiating. That is the only division that I understand has an agreement, but I'm not fully informed on this matter.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Yes, I really don't want to take up that much more time. Could there be some association between the Minister of Community Services and the Department of Education, through the school boards, to encourage the school boards to allow their facilities to be used for these services and, in fact, to even bring in the teaching staff into this type of an operation. I think that there are some schools that do provide a facility where the children are allowed to have their lunch at those particular schools and I don't think the school boards really like it; they don't want to get that involved in it, but should we be pushing a little bit more to get involved in such a situation. It appears to me that there are professionals in the school board and this is what we're trying to do, you know, upgrade the services and maybe this is the group that we should be asking for some help.

**MRS. G. TURNBULL:** I really believe that this is an important area of expansion. I think in some ways the whole school system has been a bit perverse on the whole subject, in that I always found when my children were below 12 years old, when they could have done with some Lunch-and-After-School programs, that the school wouldn't do anything about it and then when they got in Junior High and they're perfectly able to look after themselves, you couldn't get them home because the school had things organized for them all the time. I don't really know why we have to be so awkward about these things but yes, I think there really is an area of co-operation that needs to be developed here.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I agree with Mrs. Turnbull, and I don't think it should be political. I think that it's the future of these children that is involved and I can't see politics coming into it, although they are there. I'm sorry about that.

Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. The hour is past 12:30. Mrs. Turnbull, I believe we'll move on to the next people on the agenda at 8:00 this evening.

So could committee rise please.