



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. 8 - 2:00 p.m., FRIDAY, 25 JUNE, 1982.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON STATUTORY REGULATIONS AND ORDERS
Friday, 25 June, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN — Mr. D. Scott.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order please. This afternoon, we'll continue with the list as originally started. I would like, first off, before we start to bring forward the delegates who are making presentations, that last evening we had a couple of points of order.

One, that some of the briefs were more related to the regulations that will follow than the Act itself; the Act being mostly Enabling Legislation framework within which the regulations will be drawn as well.

So, there will be a public presentations again in the summer on the regulations portion. Now, I don't want to limit people from speaking on what they would like to see or the direction that they'd like to see the regulations come forward in, but I would caution you, try to speak to the Bill in the spirit that the Bill is formed and also, perhaps if you wish, toward the regulation side briefly as to the spirit that you wish those regulations to follow as well.

Another point, I cautioned the members themselves that, once again, we're here to hear the delegations, to ask questions of the delegations and not get into a dialogue or get into a discourse, if you wish, with the delegations.

So, could we start please. Is Mrs. Hayward here please?

Mr. Nordman.

MR. R. NORDMAN: The length of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh no, I didn't mention it. I'm sorry. As well - come forward ma'am - length of time as well, we started off yesterday with a very lengthy presentation. Last night we moved along much better. Most people kept their presentations to approximately 15 minutes or no more; the written presentation.

If the members here want to keep you longer, then that's up to me to try and shorten their questions down perhaps. I would prefer if you would make your presentations and keep them within a 15 minute time frame, if you would please.

Mrs. Hayward.

MRS. J. HAYWARD: My name is Joanna Hayward. Heather Andrews is here with me. We are both single parents with small children. Heather has three and I have four.

Our main concern and problem, at this point in our life, is the welfare and well-being of our children. Single parent families need Day Care assistance most desperately. Heather and I have an added problem. We are shift workers and work some weekends. Heather and I are nurses working in a hospital. Unfortunately, working in a hospital is not a 9 to 5, five-day-a-week job and, therefore, Day Care Centres are of no use to us. Working shift work, a lot of weekends and when we do work days, we leave the house at 7:00 a.m. as we start work at 7:30.

To tell us to quit our jobs and find day positions is impossible, as we would be giving up our professions and without that income, we cannot exist. Welfare is another possibility, but how degrading and unstimulating and, would it not cost the government more than to supply us with a homemaker when we are willing to work.

Heather's crisis of one year with help from Family Services of a homemaker is about to end. She has been told an appeal for an extension will likely be denied as she is now to stand on her own two feet and her three children are now her sole responsibility. The social worker has given her some alternatives for her to follow, as her homemaker is being taken out of the home.

One, she strongly suggests, is to quit her profession so she can work days and make use of Day Care Centres. This is a job which she has waited six months for; besides, we all know how scarce jobs are. Also in desperation Heather said it might be easier to go on welfare as, with all the different arrangements, she would have to make to cover her shifts the children would be pushed into complete disarray. It was suggested that, yes, perhaps this would be an alternative.

There is a growing need for qualified Day Care Services and Homemaker Services, 40 percent of today's working force are women. Single parents are increasing, rather than diminishing, and our main concern is our children, tomorrow's future citizens. It is very difficult for them when their only parent has to work and they have to conform to strangers. Are our children being thought of first? I do not think that Heather and I are unique in our situation of shift work and weekend work as there are many professions and jobs that do cover a 24-hour day. Is anything being done to help these people or are we being discriminated against because of our profession we have chosen; a profession which is universal and a world necessity? I may be looking after a member of your family, won't you help me to look after mine so that I may work? Having someone come into the home appears to be the only clear solution at this point in time, even if there was a 24-hour Day Care Centre open which would be fine for our preschoolers. What would we do with our school age children, still too young to look after themselves before school, after school and at lunch time? How would we be able to get them to a Day Care Centre at 4:00 p.m. when we have already left for work at 3:00 p.m? How much disruption in their lives are we going to instill upon them and what will the future hold for them if their lives are one continual turmoil? Are we contributing to juvenile delinquency at a later date?

Informed observers have concluded that, while providing quality Day Care may be costly, it is a pittance when compared to the cost of repairing damages done by care that is anything but. Heather and I would like to be able to hire our own Day Care or Homemaker Worker but unfortunately if we have to pay the going rate of approximately \$10.00 a day per child, with three and four children our salaries would be eaten up by child care expenses. What we would like to see is to be able to receive some kind of subsidy. Is it

such an impossibility that these people could not be hired by the person in need, screened by a person or persons with some kind of control kept on the situation, therefore cutting down on the cost of the middlemen.

All I ask for is some kind of assistance, our future looks grim at the present time. Our assistance from you will be gradually depleting as our children become of age to look after themselves. If they are to lead a happy life so much depends on you.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Hayward. One second, there maybe some questions for you. Does anyone have any questions, any committee members?

Mr. Evans.

HON. L. EVANS: So, really I guess in a way you're asking for a form of night care in a sense.

MRS. J. HAYWARD: Well, there are a lot of shift work people, there are a lot of people that do work a 24 hour day and there is nothing for us.

HON. L. EVANS: But I gather what you prefer is not simply a Family Child Care facility that's handy to mothers and families and that would operate in the evening, but your preference would be for the government to find funds to have a homemaker to come in and actually be with the children at that time. It's really a subsidized babysitting service is really what you're asking for.

MRS. J. HAYWARD: This seems to be the only conclusion I can come to at this point unless there was a Family Day Care Centre in each community, but I can't see how we would be able to get our children that are in school to a Day Care Centre when we're already working. If there was an evening Day Care Centre open it would be all right for our preschool children, but what about our children that are of school age?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Evans.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Did you say that a friend of yours had obtained some assistance through our Department?

MRS. J. HAYWARD: We both have a Homemaker in our homes right now for a period of one year through Family Services.

HON. L. EVANS: For one year? And why is it terminated now?

MRS. J. HAYWARD: At one year our lives are supposed to be completely settled.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I believe the delegate is describing a Child Welfare program that we have in existence and it is limited, as you indicate, to the one year.

At any rate, we will certainly consider your request. The problem, as usual, seems to be where do we find the money for all this? I think related to that though,

perhaps we should give consideration - and I guess this is what you're asking us to do - consideration, apart from a Homemaker Service, a type of Child Care that would be available in the evening. That would be your second best, is that correct?

MRS. J. HAYWARD: Yes, that's correct.

HON. L. EVANS: Okay, thank you very much.

MRS. J. HAYWARD: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Mr. Nordman.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Just a point here. Have we any idea how many people that fall into this category?

MRS. J. HAYWARD: There are a lot of shift work people, stewardesses, people that work in airports, waitresses, people that work in stores, they're open 'till 9:30, 10:00 o'clock at night now, nurses. There are women in the police force now, fire departments. Men are single parents, too, and they fall into the same category.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Fall into the same category. I was just curious as to how many we might be talking about, whether there could be some special - that they are falling into a special category, really, a little different than what the ordinary Day Care program is set up for and I can only sympathize with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Hammond.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, I have a question on the homemaker's service. Is this a subsidized program, do you pay part of it?

MRS. J. HAYWARD: Yes.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What would you be subsidized at?

MRS. J. HAYWARD: Well, I presently work 12 days a month and I pay \$120 for the 12 days a month.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The other question, Mr. Chairman, does the Homemaker come in when you're working on a 24-hour basis or how does it work?

MRS. J. HAYWARD: No, she works the same hours that I work.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Hammond, any further questions?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: No, I think not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further? Thank you very much for your presentation, Mrs Hayward.

MRS. J. HAYWARD: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Burns here? Mrs. Marilyn Bouw.

Friday, 25 June, 1982

MRS. M. BOUW: Thank you for this opportunity to participate in the process of developing and advancing the Day Care situation in the Province of Manitoba.

My name is Marilyn Bouw and I represent the Board of Directors and the staff of Day Nursery Centre. Day Nursery Centre has been providing the quality Day Care for families in the core area since 1909. We strongly feel that a Day Care Act is important and necessary for the following reasons:

Firstly, Day Cares need to be regulated and quality guidelines designed to maintain quality care. Some guidelines exist now but are not being regulated. In particular, we take issue with Item 6(2) of the proposed bill as it seems to exempt from licensing any person providing private home Day Care, and would seem to encourage, rather than discourage, the situation alluded to earlier with large numbers of children in a home understimulated. The item reads "A person who provides private home Day Care may apply for a license to do so, and a Director may, on an application, issue a license to provide home Day Care to the person providing it." But no license is required under this Act by the person providing private home Day Care. We feel that, being given this option, persons wishing to run private home Day Care Centres under inadequate conditions have no restrictions on them.

Another point, parents need to be assured that they are receiving quality Day Care for their child, regardless of which Centre they attend. Every Day Care should provide an environment that is conducive to the health, safety, and well-being of the children.

Day care should promote the overall development of the children by providing stimulating experiences in all facets of development, and this would be aided by the availability of adequate funding for staff so that the ratios would be as has been previously suggested. Profit-making Day Care is in the business of making money and not providing quality care for children. These Centres should not be allowed to operate on this basis but should be expected to adhere to regulations with adequate input from parents and staff involved.

I had intended to go into a few suggestions that we felt should be included in regulations but, as you pointed out, we would be willing to discuss this with the Committee when it is available for regulation development. We just wish to say that we endorse the standards which have been presented by the Manitoba Child Care Association and the Coalition on Day Care.

Thank you for this opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much Mrs. Bouw. Before we go on it's been brought to my attention that I may have mislead. This committee will be sitting for the Regulations; there will be a special task force appointed by the Department of Community Services to do the regulations drawing up; it won't be this committee per se.

MRS. M. BOUW: Well, I can go through our list if you like but I think what you meant was that I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's right. There will be another review mechanism to make presentations on regulations.

Mr. Evans.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. Just to elaborate on what the Chairman said. We will be in touch with everyone who has presented a brief to us and, indeed, everyone else who would like to have some sort of an outline which will provide a basis for subsequent discussion with my Legislative Assistant, Ms Phillips, and other persons, to get your views and anyone else who chooses to give us some views which relate to regulations. So we will definitely be in touch with you at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Hammond.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I guess the only thing I wanted to ask. Are there any of the regulations that you're recommending that you would like to see in the bill? Is there anything that you would like to see included in the bill, rather than in regulation?

MRS. M. BOUW: Well, one that I can think of, Item 3, and 1, and 2 allude to responsibility to provide proper environment and for program activities.

Our Day Care Centre especially feels very strongly about nutrition that is provided for the children. Perhaps I have missed it but I didn't see it in the bill. We would recommend that some mention be made of a nutrition requirement, and it is our suggestion along with the Coalition and the Child Care Association that each child, each day, be given a total of 75 percent of the child's daily nutritional requirement.

Now, in the areas that we serve, according to a number of polls that we have taken of parents, nutritional information is very lacking in the parents. The situation is often that children come to the Centre with very little breakfast, if any, lunches that would be sent along if they were required would be very inadequate, and the children picked up at 6 o'clock are generally rushed home, given some snack food in place of supper and end up spending the day with barely any nutritional intake. It is felt by our Centre that by providing, I believe it is actually 79 percent in Day Nursery Centre, we are benefiting the children as well as the staff in the program because children with inadequate nutrition do not learn and are instead disruptive. We feel very strongly that this is a requirement. Now, whether it be included in the Act or the bill, or whether it be very strongly enforced as a regulation, this is our position.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Mrs. Bouw, you referred to Section 6(2). Did you examine the definition that we used to describe private home Day Care in the definitions on the second page which is different than Family Child Day Care? We made a distinction between Family Day Care and anyone who has more than four children having to have a licence than people, you know, with two or three children. At that point, they may apply for a licence, but we felt to make the Act enforceable that to find a neighbour who was looking after my child or your child in a home, we would have to run up and down all the streets of all the towns and cities in the province looking in windows, but it would be very difficult to enforce, so perhaps it was better to have a cut-off line and, say, if I decide

that my neighbour is trustworthy and will look after my child well, that's one thing, but once a person has more than four, we felt that at that stage they must have a licence. Now does that not sound reasonable to you, or do you think we should licence every single person who looks after someone else's child in their home?

MRS. M. BOUW: I admit that the point did elude us. I suppose one child at a neighbour's is one issue, but up to four children might be desirable. I realize the difficulty of making a limit.

MS M. PHILLIPS: It was a concern about the enforceability, and when you made reference that we should be requiring a licence for everyone, I just wanted you to have that understanding of why we made that decision. If you still feel that we should lower that and say everyone must have a licence. Those are the kinds of things the Committee should be considering.

MRS. M. BOUW: Well, I appreciate the clarification and I can see that your position would be very difficult to knock on doors to find out. Not having given consideration to it, I can't really answer whether, perhaps three should be the cutoff; four preschoolers is a handful, depending on the age, but I can see that it would be difficult to . . .

MS M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, in the definition we say that you can only have two under two in that four, and it's also including the person's own children. So if I had two preschoolers and I took in two babies I wouldn't need a licence, but if I took in another preschooler I would, because we recognize it is a handful and that we should have standards applied to those situations. We use the word "private"; we figured if that's my private arrangement with you and I trust you, we should leave some of that discretion to the parents.

Another point that you made in terms of nutrition. We do have that in Section 33, under (f). Nutrition is mentioned and will be outlined in the regulations. So when we put out a Working Paper on the Regulations and asked for comments, we'll certainly take into account your experience on that issue.

MRS. M. BOUW: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No other questions?
Mr. Kovnats.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Just on a point of order, would you allow the person making the presentation to answer the questions posed to her by Ms Phillips.

MRS. M. BOUW: If you wish an answer as to our feeling about the four and under in a private home, at present it does sound reasonable. I would have to discuss it with the staff and the Board for their further feelings, in order to be representative of their opinions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? Thank you very much, Mrs. Bouw.

Next is Barbara Marquand. I might also add, for the people making presentations, if there are any ques-

tions you do not wish to answer, you're certainly entitled not to answer them as well. We're not a court of law here and we're not putting people under oath.

Go ahead, Mrs. Marquand.

MRS. B. MARQUAND: Mr. Chairman, I represent Family Services, Special Needs Family Day Care Program. It is with great pleasure that the Special Needs Family Day Care Program and the Homemaker Department of Family Services comment to the Legislative Committee regarding Bill 21 of The Community Day Care Standards Act.

We have read Bill 21 and feel that the move by the government to ensure safe, emotional and physical environments of children in Day Care settings is a positive move forward for Manitoba children.

Because our Day Care and Homemaker Programs are predominately Child Care Services, we take special interest in these developments and view such legislation as a further step in strengthening family life through Day Care.

I would like to briefly tell you about our Family Special Needs Family Day Care Program. Special Needs has been referred to by several people without very much backup. I would like to tell you that the government certainly does sponsor a Special Needs Family Day Care Service.

The service provides care for children from four weeks to 12 years of age who may have physical disabilities, medical, mental or emotional problems or who are at risk as a result of stressful family situations, which includes child abuse. Short-term care is given to children in families where one parent is undergoing medical or psychiatric treatment. The service aims at preventing the development and/or the intensification of difficulties experienced by babies, young children, and those with physical or emotional problems through the provision of carefully screened and closely supervised Family Day Care placements for the children and the support to the parents and the Family Day Care providers.

In our special needs, we include the physically handicapped; mentally retarded; medical problems; developmentally slow children; abused and neglected children; babies and children under three at risk because of failure to thrive; children of teenage mothers who are becoming increasing at this point - these young teenage mothers have limited capabilities to deal with parenting; children with families in crisis over parents being physically or mentally ill. While all the parents do not receive subsidization through the province for their Day Care payments, most are low income working single parents, many recently experiencing marriage breakdown or they are off welfare and just into jobs.

I'd like to state here that we have an administrative grant through the Department of Community Services and Corrections to administer the program and the operational costs are through the Child Day Care Program.

The referrals come from many other agencies and organizations such as the Provincial Day Care Office; the Child Development Clinic; the Child Guidance Clinic; the Children's Aid Society of Eastern Manitoba and of Winnipeg; the Health Science Children's Centre; the City of Winnipeg Welfare Department; Canada

Employment Centre; the Department of Community Services and Corrections; the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded; Pregnancy Distress; the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society; the churches who are sponsoring the Asian refugee families, plus the hospital social services and the psychiatric departments who may be dealing with parents who have suddenly experienced mental or emotional breakdown.

Our Family Day Care homes are selected, licenced and supervised by professional Family Service Workers according to the Provincial Day Care Licensing Regulations. Training and information programs are held regularly for our Family Day Care providers.

Last year the fee for the handicapped children was extended, and we are now able to pay our Family Day Care providers the extra fee for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped children in our Family Day Care homes.

That is really what I wanted to tell you about the Day Care Department. We do have a Homemaker's Service and Mrs. McFadyen, who is the supervisor of that service, is here and would speak to you, if you wish to hear about that program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that it? You had some specific references to Bill 21 on Page 6, would you care to . . .

MRS. B. MARQUAND: Yes, I wondered whether you wanted to hear from Mrs. McFadyen next, or whether you'd like me to go on? I will go on, and you can carry on from there.

We do acknowledge, with approval the regulations in Bill 21 in general, specifically we would like to comment on sections 27 and 28 in regard to the establishment of a review committee to advise the Minister on the requirements for qualifications of staff for facilities and training.

One area, that has not been addressed in Bill 21, and neither does it fall into any other category is whether there is a need for standards and regulations set up by the government in the Homemaker Child Care Services such as the Family Service Homemaking Program. The homemakers are going into the homes, giving care for children under supervision of professional staff into the homes of the clients. At present, the legislative authority over the Homemaker Program rests with the special dependent care provisions of The Social Allowance Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, would you like to bring Mrs. McFadyen on to make comments on this as well?

MRS. B. MARQUAND: Yes, Leyah, would you like to come and speak to the homemaker development?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If she wishes, since this is a joint presentation delegate.

MRS. L. McFADYEN: Well, the Homemaker Department of Family Services has been discussed today and we're a short-term service provided to a families suffering stress, a Child Care organization supervised by professional staff, the homemakers go into homes and care for children while parents are recovering from a recent separation, divorce or stress. Some of

the circumstances that would warrant a person having a homemaker would be sickness or disability, sudden custody changes, shift work, irregular hours. Those kinds of situations have been allowed one year of homemaker service which has been decided upon as a reasonable length of time to give that person, hopefully, to make other arrangements for their children. That's because of the tremendous cost of our program. It's close to \$7 an hour, around \$1,400 a month, and if you figure out what more than a year of homemaking service could cost, it's really quite tremendous. So, it is a problem for people who are shift workers, and we are concerned about what happens to those kids when they leave our service.

Our objectives of our program are to strengthen family life by preventing family disintegration and preventing the parents withdrawal from the work force.

I'll just kind of skip through; I agree with the comments that Barbara made about Bill 21. Some of the problems that our clients face when they leave our service have been outlined today. We feel that particularly the shift work clients have nothing, people like nurses, who are already trained are not eligible for further training allowances. They are professional people and have a few years of tremendous problems in making arrangements for their children. Some kind of arrangement other than homemaking service would be ideal for them, perhaps even more subsidies to be allowed for the actual cost of their baby-sitters in the evening, if they have to pay privately to have someone come in would be a recommendation.

I guess, you know, basically that's what our program is. It's an income security program governed by The Social Allowances Act, and it's a Child Care program but not a Day Care legislated program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, are there are questions from the committee? Your name is Mrs. McFadyen, is it not?

Mrs. Hammond.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What would a reasonable subsidy be for the shift worker?

MRS. L. McFADYEN: The average cost of homemaking service - because it would depend on how many hours the person works - right now is \$6.82, I believe an hour. For anything over eight hours, the government is billed time-and-a-half. An average cost would be \$1,400 a month. Over 50 percent of our clients are totally subsidized by the government; the remaining clients do have a fee-for-service that is needs tested. The average fee would be under \$100 a month, as many of our clients are extremely low income.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? No more questions? Thank you very much, ladies, for your presentation.

Next could I call on Dick Martin please, and Pauline Russell.

MR. D. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Members of the Committee, I want to introduce my colleague, Pauline Russell, who is a Board member of the Manitoba Government Employees Association

and a member of their Equal Rights and Opportunities Committee.

This Brief is being presented on behalf of the Manitoba Federation of Labour which represents approximately 74,000 workers in the Province of Manitoba and, of course, those members have a lot of families. This Brief has had direct input from the Canadian Union of Public Employees and the Manitoba Government Employees Association, two of our largest unions representing a lot of Day Care workers.

We would like to congratulate the Government of Manitoba for bringing forward this piece of legislation and sincerely hope that the enactment of The Community Child Day Care Standards Act, Bill 21, will lead to a higher standard of Child Care in our province. We would like to emphasize that adequate funding must be available, through the government program, to allow for enforcement of the standards as set out in the Act and the subsequent regulations. A Community Child Day Care Standards Act by itself means nothing unless the funding levels are such that will allow the various facilities to meet the standards.

We are at the point in history here in Manitoba where the argument is not about "whether there should be Day Care" but rather "what kind of Day Care." Given that the percentage of women in the labour force in Manitoba is over 51 percent, it is obvious that there is a need for an organized system of Child Care Services. We are here to argue that the system must be structured in such a way so as to provide quality child care accessible to all who require it from infancy to age 12.

In terms of the standards which we would like to see incorporated into the Act and its Regulations, we generally recommend those put forward by the Coalition for Day Care and the Manitoba Child Care Association, and have attached these documents as appendices to our brief.

We feel that it is imperative that when regulations pursuant to this Act are being drafted that groups such as The Coalition for Day Care and the Manitoba Child Care Association will be consulted. This in keeping with the stated "open government" policy of this administration.

Although we do not intend to elaborate in detail on the standards issue, we would like to emphasize certain aspects of public policy toward Day Care as addressed in the Act.

I'll call upon Pauline to continue.

MS PAULINE RUSSELL: The first of these aspects with which we would like to deal is that of accessibility.

It is difficult to provide up-to-date statistics in regard to the number of children under the age of 12 of working mothers in Manitoba. If we look at the 1973 Labour Canada Study, which found that there were approximately 27,000 children, between the ages of infancy to six years, of working mothers in Manitoba; and note that the participation rate for married women in the labour force in Manitoba has increased by about 10 percent since then, we can assume then that a figure of 30,000 would not be exaggerated. When you look at the fact that the current government program provides approximately 9,000 spaces, it is obvious there is still a wide gap between the numbers of children who may need care and the actual number of

spaces available. Of particular concern is the issue of space available in licensed facilities for children from infancy to age two.

A study on Page 2 of the brief by the Day Care Information Centre in 1978, published by the Ministry of National Health and Welfare, reported the following number of children with working mothers and placements in government licensed Day Care. I won't trip over my tongue and try and read the statistics but it shows that a total of 2,931,000 children, of those children only 2.7 percent were in government licensed Day Care.

On Page 3 we show the follow-up study done in 1980 showed 3,203,000 children, of those 3.4 percent were in government licensed Day Care.

Clearly over the two years from 1978 to 1980, there were no appreciable inroads to alleviate a totally inadequate Day Care system in Canada. Although we do not have the statistical breakdown for Manitoba, we know that it is a critical problem here also. There are very few group centres which take children under two and since the number of Family Day Care spaces is only approximately 1,200, there is obviously a great shortage in this area.

Also, when we look at the issue of Lunch and After School care for children ages 6 to 12, we are again confronted with huge discrepancy between the number of children needing care and the provision of licensed spaces.

The need for Lunch and After School Programs will be ever increasing as more and more children of working parents move from the Day Care system into the public schools. Children 12 years and under should not have to fend for themselves after school hours. "Latch-key" children as they are termed, are being given more responsibility than they should for their own care, which can be overpowering to them. It compromises the child's safety as well as inviting problems relating to delinquency. Again, we do not have recent statistics, but a 1977 study estimated that there were approximately 58,000 children between the ages of 6 and 13 of working mothers in Manitoba. There are currently only approximately 2,000 spaces.

What we have then, is a public program which excludes approximately two-thirds of the children who could make use of it. The situation is analogous to having a Public School Program to which only one-third of the children have access. Other social programs such as Medicare has, as one of its main tenets, the principle of universal access and we strongly feel that this should be an integral part of the Day Care Program.

We should make it clear that we are not saying that all children must attend Day Care, we are only saying that a realistic choice must be available to parents of young children. We agree strongly with the statement in the 1980 "Status of Day Care in Canada" that: "Of major concern is that many families are unable to find acceptable Child Care arrangements and too many children are being left in situations that jeopardize their safety and their well-being."

Another area of major concern when reviewing the Day Care Program in Manitoba is that of the wages paid to the Child Care workers. Although we realize the issue of wages is one that is determined between boards and their employees and, as such, is not spe-

cifically addressed in the Act, we feel that it must be emphasized in these discussions.

Since Day Care is a labour intensive industry and since approximately 80 to 85 percent of Day Care budgets are allocated to salaries, the funding levels established by the Day Care Program will have a direct impact on the wages paid to those working in this field. The Act refers to the qualifications of Day Care workers in Section 29(1), and if there is a recognition of policy for the need for trained staff there must also be a recognition of policy for adequate funding levels.

A look at rates being paid today to Day Care workers in Manitoba indicates a very low level of remuneration. For example, the Study on Day Care commissioned by the United Way of Winnipeg (1978) indicated that "50 percent of those surveyed working in public centres had either a Child Care Certificate, a University Degree, or a Teacher's Certificate." However, the great majority, approximately 80 percent, earned less than \$12,000 a year, and of that group, 65 percent earned less than \$9,000 a year.

One of the union organized Day Care facilities pays \$12,000 a year for Day Care workers with training and \$11,000 a year for Day Care workers without training. We can safely assume that these unionized rates are higher than those paid to the majority of Day Care workers who are not unionized.

A standard in terms of wages for Day Care workers has been set at the Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery where the rates were established through a joint job evaluation program, with participation of the union and the hospital.

Although we are not saying that these are the optimum rates for Day Care workers, these evaluated rates are at least a step in the right direction.

It is ironic to note that although these are negotiated rates to which the Health Sciences Centre has agreed, the Day Care Program does not fund sufficiently to meet these salaries and, therefore, this nursery's very existence is in serious jeopardy at this moment.

If we look at rates paid to another two-year Community College trained group - that is the nurses - we see a starting salary of \$19,500 a year. Since the great majority of people working in the field are female, what we have is another example of low wage job ghetto for women which must be addressed. There must be adequate government funding made available to ensure decent wages for Day Care workers so that they will no longer be expected to subsidize the provision of this essential social service.

The final aspect of the government policy towards Day Care on which we would like to comment is that of Profit Day Care. We note with regret that there is no provision in the Act which would prohibit the further licensing of commercial Day Care establishments. It is the position of the Manitoba Federation of Labour that the provision of an essential social service such as Day Care, should not be done for profit. It is of interest to note that the NDP administration in Saskatchewan, in 1975, passed a regulation pursuant to its Act, which stated that all new Day Care Centres must be nonprofit societies or cooperatives.

We note that the NDP Government here in Manitoba has put a freeze on the building of new proprietary nursing homes and feel that the same principle is involved with commercial Day Care.

In Manitoba we are fortunate that there are at present very few commercial Day Care establishments. However, one of the larger commercial providers - Kindercare/Mini-Skool - has recently been expanding here. We would like to note at this time that Great West Life Assurance Co. announced just recently that they would be withdrawing financial involvement with Kindercare.

The problem with private Day Care is that it is impossible to make profits and at the same time provide the best possible environment for the emotional, intellectual and physical development of young children. If you look at the experience of nonprofit Centres here in Manitoba, you will see that the great majority of them barely have enough funds to make ends meet, and in fact, a good number of them are operating with deficit budgets. How, therefore, can a commercial Centre take 30 to 40 percent off the top and still argue that the quality of services is maintained. In order to keep the profit margin up, the wages must be kept low. The ratio of children to staff must be kept high, the quality of the nutritional program must be compromised, and the list goes on. To quote from a recent publication called "Good Day Care": "Low salaries form the basis of profits in Day Care and since women make up the overwhelming majority of Day Care Workers, the successful operation of corporate Day Care Centres depends upon the exploitation of their labour."

The argument that strict standards in place will automatically resolve the problem previously alluded to, with respect to commercial Centres, has not been borne out when reviewing the experiences in other provinces such as Alberta and Ontario, where there are a larger number of profit Centres. Also, if we look at the situation of private nursing homes here in Manitoba, although they are governed by standards which are applicable to both proprietary and nonproprietary facilities, there have been numerous examples of compromising the quality of the service in order to maintain the required profit level.

As we have indicated earlier, there is a tremendous gap between the number of children who may need care outside their homes and the number of government sponsored spaces. Are we going to allow the private sector entrepreneurs to move in to fill this void, or are we, as a community, going to commit ourselves to a policy which would have as its objective the provision through a public program of quality Child Care services for all Manitoba children? In order to ensure the latter, we urge the government to amend the legislation to specifically prohibit the further licensing of any new commercial Day Care establishments.

Furthermore, in supporting publicly operated Day Care, we do not believe that the profit motive debate is the only argument for or against privately operated Day Care. We are convinced however, that promoting privately operated Day Care systems inevitably leads to economic, religious and social ghettoization of children; the rich go to the "rich" Day Care, the poor go to the "cheap" Day Care, and so on. To avoid the trappings and disadvantages of a caste like society in the future, we must be especially careful not to ghettoize our children in their early childhood.

In our view, community-based Day Care and parent co-operatives have an advantage, in that they express

social and economic needs on a broader base, compared to a commercial operator, whose ultimate reason for being in business is profit. Again, we must have public Day Care for the same reasons that we have public school systems.

We see the directions for the future as following. The goal towards which we must work takes the shape of a triangle with government's commitment to Child Care in one corner, the job world's adjustment to the needs of parents and children in the second, and the parents' own willingness in the third.

Drawing from the recommendations of the National Day Care Task Force, we see development of Child Care in Manitoba as follows. As a starting point the Provincial Government of Manitoba must pass regulations setting out specific standards covering qualifications for Child Care staff, programs, physical environments for Child Care, group size and staff-child ratios. The government would also then be responsible for monitoring and enforcing these standards through licensing programs.

Child care is not only an issue in the city. Rural and northern areas need Child Care programs tailored to their own special characteristics. These communities should be able to design the kind of programs that suit their own needs, knowing that the resources they need will be available from the government.

The government must also set out careful standards for Family and Group Day Care homes. There should be minimum standards established for the physical setting of the home, that is, the surroundings in which the children spend their day and for the quality of programs offered by care givers.

These care givers should also have a support system of services. These services could include toy and equipment banks that would lend supplies to Child Care Workers and rotate them through Day Care homes, and co-operative group purchasing of needed goods and services which would cut costs to care givers. There could also be advice and information for care givers on the financial side of their work, and a system of back-up care givers who would help out in emergencies or times when the regular one is sick.

Workplace Day Care, another option, is minimal at present, but there is an increasing need for this option. These Centres offer advantages to all, including benefits to the employer in reduced staff turnover, lower rates of absenteeism and a better corporate public relations image.

In addition to standards for the care of children during the day, there must be programs established for children whose parents work shifts, that is anytime during a twenty-four hour period. These standards should cover such areas as cots and other related necessities relevant to the care of children at night.

With adjustments such as increasing staff and increased funding, infant care could become a reality in Day Care Centres now in existence. Rather than excluding infants and toddlers from Child Care due to the expense, the government should be taking steps now to find the appropriate solutions to this problem.

Looking at the declining enrolment in the public schools, Lunch and After School Programs should be one of the easiest programs to establish. The space is available and in view of the growing number of "latch-key" children, the need is evident. Further to this, by

acknowledging that there is a need for more Day Care due to the increasing numbers of children of working parents, Lunch and After School Programs will become more and more necessary.

I'll now turn back to Dick.

MR. D. MARTIN: Thank you, Pauline.

In conclusion, we would again like to commend the government for bringing forward this legislation and reiterate our concerns that there be adequate funding to allow facilities to meet the standards; that there be strict enforcement of these standards; that there be an expansion of the number of spaces; that there be no further licensing of profit Day Cares. Groups such as the Manitoba Child Care Association and the Day Care Coalition have drafted standards that they feel should be set in Manitoba. These two groups are comprised of both Child Care Workers and parents. We generally recommend the standards that they have drafted.

We recognize their expertise in the application, as an example, of such issues as child/staff ratios. We also recognize the people in government who have had years of experience in Child Care and their structures.

The first responsibility rests with the government to provide a policy and financial initiatives to build a network of quality Child Care systems encompassed in regulated and enforced Child Care standards.

We thank you for having this opportunity to raise these issues with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Martin and Ms Russell.

First off, the questions. Ms Russell, would you like to come up as well and people can direct the questions to either party. Feel free, either of you, to respond as well, please.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I thank the Manitoba Federation of Labour and the delegation for the well-thought-out brief and the policy direction which they believe that Manitoba Government should move in and I think generally, not in every detail or every measure, of course, but generally there is agreement in the way we want to go.

I just had a couple of questions. One that intrigues me is your reference on Page 10 to the Workplace Day Care and I'm just wondering whether the MFL had any suggestions as to what should be done or what could be done to promote Workplace Day Care facilities. Such, of course, are possible now and it would seem to me that, in large measure, it's a matter of perhaps negotiating with the employer and that . . . Is this not a matter for negotiations? I guess this is what I'm getting to, the usual contractual negotiations between the union and the management. Or are you looking for the government to do something in addition to that?

MR. D. MARTIN: I'll pass it to Pauline first.

MS P. RUSSELL: My first thought is yes, you're right, this is something between the employer and the employee, but I also believe that there could be some kind of incentive from the government to the employer

to help in the establishment. I'm not saying, we don't believe that the government should be responsible for an on-site Day Care, but we feel that they could be helpful in getting the implementation and using their expertise to help employers, who don't have any knowledge of how to set up a Day Care Centre on site, and that's where the government's help could come in.

MR. D. MARTIN: If I could just add one thing, Mr. Evans, is that you're correct, but in terms of the subject of negotiations, the collective bargaining, and that's a possibility that can be achieved. But of course, there's another point. Not every workplace has an organized group of employees and in such they are left out in the cold. We believe that there can be co-operatives established but as Pauline said, that will require probably at least managerial administrative assistance in establishing such a co-operative and it needs some government leadership.

HON. L. EVANS: Thanks. Well very good. I'm not supposed to get into a dialogue but there are some initiatives now being taken by MGEA with regard to this and, hopefully, there will be something put in place in the not too distant future.

On another matter, one dilemma that we're faced with is the usual dilemma, as where do we get all the money to do all the things we'd like to do. You know, the pot is limited in any one year; we've got so many dollars in the Treasury and there are demands for those dollars from all kinds of departments, from Agriculture to Highways, to Health, etc., and of course, this department and this program is only one area. At the moment we're spending between \$11 and \$12 million for the Day Care Program as it now exists. Obviously to get higher standards, to have better staff ratios, to make sure there are better wages paid, etc., will require money. In other words, higher standards mean more money.

At the same time we were told by the Coalition and Day Care yesterday that there are simply inadequate, and I guess this brief referred also to the fact that there are an inadequate number of spaces. I think, roughly, you referred to about one-third of the demand that exists out there, the estimated demand - only one-third of that is covered now by licensed spaces. So there's obviously need for a geographic or a physical expansion of the spaces.

This may be a very awkward question for you to answer, but I'll put it anyway therefore. What would you give priority on, given the fact that yes, we may get some more money but, you know, there is always a limit, so would you put it more towards raising the standards of the existing facilities, or would you use it more towards expanding the spaces so that more people can take advantage of what we have, perhaps at a lower level than we would achieve then if we followed the first option?

MR. D. MARTIN: Well, I don't think I'll fall for your question and the answer will be both. I don't want to be facetious in my answer though, because I think it's a good question, with the exception of this: we believe that Day Care has to be regarded in terms of the whole public in the same type of light that Medi-

care was observed by the general population a matter of only a few years ago - Pharmacare, Old Age Pensions, that type of thing - as an all-encompassing social program. So we don't think that it should take a second place in terms of priorities. I know that government has to deal with those particular problems from time to time but at the same point, we want to make the emphasis to you that we think that Child Care should be put on the level of Medicare and other programs that are absolutely necessary to the well-being of Manitobans and their families and the future generations. It's critical; it's as critical to us as proper medical treatment of diseases.

MS P. RUSSELL: I would like to add one point. At the onset of that you said "we would all like to have." It's not a question of liking - we'd like to have good Day Care. There are people out there that need it; they have to have it in order to work. So it's not a question of they'd like good Day Care; they need it and it's imperative for them to work and then following on what Dick said is it's a horrible problem for you to straighten out.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, therefore, Mr. Chairman, then what the delegate is saying, she would rather see the money put towards having more spaces, so that more people can have their children in Day Care.

MS P. RUSSELL: No, I'm following exactly along the line of what Dick said. When you said "like" - we'd "like to have," and I'm saying that it's not a question of we'd like to have. It's not a question, it's a fact that we need Day Care - good quantity; good quality; accessible.

MR. D. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, we're not going to make your job easier for you obviously. Our job is to advocate social change and proper funding and such, but we do sincerely believe that they are high priorities; that the space facilities, that the staff ratios are very, very important. There's really not much point to, in some ways, to have more space but not have the administrative and the Day Care workers there to carry out the program.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, I know it's a very difficult question to answer and surely we should have both. We want higher standards and we want more spaces, surely. But the real question though and what I'm saying, in effect, Mr. Chairman, is if given an additional amount of money, we have \$11 or \$12 million - let's say we double it, let's say we go up to \$25 million, so we've got that much more money. Should we use 50 percent of it towards better standards and 50 percent towards more spaces, or 75 percent towards more standards and 25 percent to additional spaces? This is a hard, real question of allocating limited funds that we're going to have to face. So this is why I was asking for a little guidance as to where would you put the emphasis, on the extension towards more spaces or the improvement of standards? Obviously we're going to go to some of both, but which would you give the emphasis to? It's a difficult question and I'm not trying to put you on the spot.

MR. D. MARTIN: Well, I don't think that we can really

provide you with a real good answer to that. I suppose the answer, as usual, in things like this, lies in a compromise of some type and that's where it is at. We just think that large increase in funding is necessary and it becomes, I suppose, not only a technical decision but a political decision.

HON. L. EVANS: Just one final question, Mr. Chairman, if I might and it's more of a technical one. In the conclusion of the Brief and elsewhere, you referred to endorsing the position put forward by the Manitoba Child Care Association and the Day Care Coalition with regard to standards. During the next several months, we will be making an effort to contact all organizations to get their views. Are you suggesting that we should not, rather than contact MFL directly, simply go to the Child Care Association and the Coalition which we will or shall we contact you, as well, with regard to discussion of standards?

MR. D. MARTIN: We would appreciate being contacted, and we would like input into devising the regulations and such. We are pointing out that, generally speaking, we do endorse their policies, though, and their expertise.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I'd like to ask Mr. Martin why he feels it's necessary to have a prohibition against profit Day Care in order to achieve the objectives that your brief essentially seeks and with which nobody would have any quarrel; that is, a publicly supported quality Child Day Care system in Manitoba, universally accessible. Why is it necessary to urge the committee or the government to invoke a prohibition on private Day Care to achieve that objective?

MR. D. MARTIN: Mr. Sherman, first of all, I thought we pretty well outlined it, but we start off with this: We believe that - and I go back and reiterate what I've said - Child Care, Day Care, should be put in a class, such as public school systems that we talk about. We talk about, I've alluded to it in terms of the Medicare, pension schemes and such, that we do not think that our children should be used as a profit motive for a profit oriented corporation to make that profit off of child care. Specifically, that we don't see how you can be in the business to make a profit and also deliver the proper nutrition, the proper staff ratios, the proper setting, and still have that good quality of Day Care.

Secondly, I might say that, as we have said in our brief, that Day Care itself should not be treated as another pair of socks in the market, or a new gizmo, or a new mouse trap which you can make your fortune on. It should have that total accessibility. We do not want to, and we said it, we do not want to have a Day Care system established for only those who can afford it and not a good Day Care system established for those who cannot afford it. We think that there has to be that universality and total accessibility to it, and the profit-operated Day Care Centres cannot provide that. Something has got to suffer.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I have difficulty in seeing why that would be the case, if there are standards, in terms of staffing ratios, in terms of space, in terms of qualifications of your Day Care workers, etc., etc. If those standards must necessarily be met before licences can be issued, then I just have difficulty with that position. Why should the taxpayer and the person who is anxious for Day Care services be frustrated by virtue of the fact that some individual or group of individuals or organizations is being prevented from operating a private Day Care Centre, even though they're prepared and must necessarily meet the standards; why should the taxpayer pay for it all? The taxpayer doesn't pay for the whole education system.

Certainly, you mention Medicare. There are lots of things that you can have done under elective surgery, if you elect to have them done, that aren't paid for by Medicare. You have the option to send your children to a public or a private school, and I have no hesitation in assuring you that all three of my children went to public schools and good public schools, but that doesn't make me opposed to private schools if you want to send your children to a private school and pay for them, provided the teachers have the required qualifications, etc.

MR. D. MARTIN: Well, in answer to it, first of all, you hit it right on the nose that public school system, as you yourself know, there was quite a fight in our history to bring about a public school system. Perhaps some day maybe we could enter, from our perspective, in discussions of other alternative forms of Day Care, but we think that a standard structure has to be in place to bring Day Care to the levels that are sought now by the individuals and the only to do that is to have a government program that lays out the initiatives and that it is on a political level, so to speak, a political level that is equal to the importance of those other programs that we've talked about. We think that you'll end up with a watered down version of what most working people want in terms of having Day Care for their children.

I go back, once again I fail to see - well, I don't understand the economics of it quite frankly and you can help me understand it - if you have a profit Day Care Centre, then something must give in order to make the profit, all other factors being equal. We believe that the factors giving will be, once again, a larger ratio of children to workers, a lower nutritional program, a not as good study in terms of learning experience and so consequently that's why we believe that it should have a standard approach and not be profit.

Do you have anything to add, Pauline, to that?

MS P. RUSSELL: My question is always, how do they make a profit, if they're maintaining those?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Because Mr. Martin said something has to give, and what gives is the parent who sends their child there. It's the parent who gives out of his or her pocketbook, if that's what they wish to do.

We could argue that all night, but my point is, Mr. Martin may need my support, he may not need my support but he might be seeking my support. I'm not in conflict with him about the desire for a quality univer-

Friday, 25 June, 1982

sal publicly accessible Day Care system in Manitoba. I'd like to see us have the best Day Care system in the country too, and therefore we need standards; but you're losing my support when you say that to do that, Sherman, you've got to prohibit private Day Care operations.

MR. D. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, if I could just respond one way by a story. I was down in Florida a couple of years ago - and I think it's a good analogy and I can't use it here because I don't think it's happened in Manitoba - but in Florida they have a public school system, as you well know too, but they also have established a large private school system. The public school system, of course, is funded by the public at large. The private schools, though, are funded just the same way they are here. However, these people believe, because of the race factor and such, that the public school system was going down, that they would pull their children out and put them into the private schools. So consequently what has ended up happening, by allowing the private schools, which obviously make profit or in most cases make profit, is that the public school system has been completely eroded because they are in total competition with people putting all of their money into the private school sector.

The reason I use that story, because I saw it first hand, is that without establishing a total accessible government-operated public school system, and allowing that total other competition to be in there, then the public school system of eroded which, quite frankly, I find appalling because it creates two classes of citizens and leads to racial and religious separations and so forth as we've talked about here. I just don't understand why anybody, at this point in time, would be opposed to having Day Care Centres operated on a nonprofit, totally governmental approach, at this time, in order to achieve that level of accessibility, universality and acceptability to the general public. As I say, perhaps someday but, at this point in time, we have to get it to this level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'd like to start moving on a little quicker if we can because, we've been for over half an hour now.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, that may be, Mr. Chairman, I agree but these are the first questions I've asked this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, that's fine.

MR. L. SHERMAN: With respect to the differences between Family Day Care, and Group Day Care, I wanted to ask Mr. Martin whether, in speaking to the positions taken by the Child Care Association, are you proposing that there would be a different set of requirements, in terms of staffing qualifications, not numbers but qualifications between Family Day Care and Group Day Care? Or am I misreading your position on that?

MR. D. MARTIN: I'll let Pauline Russell answer that?

MS P. RUSSELL: Could you repeat it please I'm afraid . . .

MR. L. SHERMAN: Do you propose that Family Day Care personnel, the staffing personnel in Family Day Care, would not be required to meet the same training qualifications as staffing personnel in Group Day Care?

MS P. RUSSELL: I don't believe that we've said that. Am I mistaken?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well you may.

MS P. RUSSELL: The main thrust in talking about what those people that are watching, taking care of, helping our children grow is that if somebody works a regular Monday to Friday, 8 to 5 job, that child is in another person's care for approximately 50 hours a week. The main thrust of what we feel is that we're not talking about custodial babysitting. For a good part of the children's lives they need to have somebody that's going to help them grow, not just physically and watching that they don't fall down and hurt themselves, or plopping them in front of a TV, we need to have people to nurture them. It should be an experiential thing.

Now I believe that in the Day Care Coalition they've talked about a grandfathering clause, which takes those people who have been doing it - I, myself, personally, have had one woman who was, and had been doing it for approximately 15 years. I know that she could take a challenge course to meet the standards. So, I'm sort of lost when you say what do we think that they should have.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, my question arises out of the presentation of material in the brief. It may be a matter of omission rather than a direct reference. The staff qualifications with reference to Group Day Care refer specifically to the standard qualifying program, Red River Community College, etc., etc. With respect to Family Day Care there's no such reference, other than to say that Family Day Care workers must have access to the same benefits as other Child Care workers, including in-service training, access to advice and consultation, etc. So, I read it, or misread it, as a differentiation in terms of the requirements for Family Day Care workers as against the requirements for Group Day Care workers. If you're telling me that there is no differentiation, your not proposing any differentiation, then that answers the question.

MS P. RUSSELL: Well, this is why we say we generally recommend, because there are certain things that we'd like to see but, for the most part, the expertise lays with people that are child care workers and parents. This is why we generally endorse what they've put forward and if there's further elements to be considered then definitely.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms Phillips.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would like to clarify, on Page 8 where you're asking for us to amend the legislation to prohibit the further licensing of any commercial Centre. You're satisfied

that we're asking, for instance, that commercial Centres must meet the standards that we will outline in the regulations or that are in the Act. That's satisfactory, you're not asking that we take over the ones that are already operating?

MS P. RUSSELL: No, that there be no further licensing.

MS M. PHILLIPS: If you are agreeing that the ones in existence have to meet the standards that we're outlining and, in fact, they do; when we get everything operational we find that they are meeting the standards, and we're not having any trouble with that in terms of supplying the quality of care that we're outlining in the Act and two years later another Day Care Centre came and asked for a license and it was shown that the ones already in operation were meeting the requirements, what would be the problem of allowing another branch or whatever, or another Centre to open up?

MS P. RUSSELL: I almost don't want to answer it. I mean we can talk about it's. I'm going to have to remove myself from the MFL and make myself a parent, and I'm really scared of the ratios that I have seen and some of the things that I have seen personally when I've gone in. Now if the ratios can be maintained, and it's all hypothetical, can they be? I have been in places and they weren't. So if you take that argument then you could also argue then, are the ones that we have now, you know, should they be allowed to stay operating? I'm sorry I can't really . . .

MS M. PHILLIPS: To follow up on that then, correct me if I'm wrong, but it seems that your concern is that dollars are diverted, as the Member from Fort Garry said, the parents pay extra to provide that profit, if they're not under the program they can charge whatever they like. So parent's dollars are being diverted to that profit, rather than the overall operation of Day Care programming in the province. Is that what your basic concern is then?

MS P. RUSSELL: Well one concern right now is that the rate charged presently in commercial Day Care Centres, up until age two is a free-for-all because the infant care is expensive and there are very few places in operation in Manitoba that provide for infant care. I find it ironic that as soon as you get to age two that the rates drop considerably and are in competition with the other non-profit ones in Winnipeg. I know that for a fact because I've gone through it, the process. So I have a little bit of trouble with that because, when you say that the parents pay a little bit more, they don't, because there's not that much more charged. So I find it very hard that some money that could go to a Centre that's operating on a deficit budget, i.e. subsidies, could be channeled from the profit places if they want to make a profit then why do they need the subsidy positions. That could be channeled over to non-profit co-operatives that are operating on deficits. I mean it appears that they want it both ways, if they want to make a profit, fine, but why do they need subsidy positions. It provides spaces I know but it's hard.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. On page 9 of

your brief you're giving a suggestion, and I presume you're suggesting to us as government that we should organize this toy and equipment bank etc., etc., a co-operative services sharing bank. We've had a concern expressed to the committee about government interfering with the operation of voluntary boards. We've made it very clear that we have no intention of interfering with the decisions the voluntary boards make. Is this not something that the voluntary boards, you know, the Presidents of the different Day Care Centres or the Directors could organize on their own? Are you suggesting here in the brief that we take that responsibility and say to all the Day Care Centres, you must share; or should we not leave that up to the Centres to determine that.

MS P. RUSSELL: Yes and no. Again it's the same thing with Workplace Day Care. It goes back to the goal, the triangle. There's three elements involved and, no, you don't specifically have to be responsible for it but we feel that there should be some kind of input, especially for the homecare givers; they're out on islands all by themselves. If there's some kind of staff qualifications committee - I don't know if there are other little committees that need to be done, but it's something to be considered. I'm not saying, yes, you have to be responsible for it but let's give it a look.

The expertise is coming from the government, so let's look at a whole bunch of avenues and there are a lot of volunteers out there that want to help, too.

MR. D. MARTIN: If I could just follow that up with one comment. We're not saying that the government unilaterally impose a system; you would obviously be in consultation with those Day Care Centres over whether they thought this would be a good idea. We're not saying you start it up and then tell them that you're taking it. You'd go and consult with them and say, do you want that and if they do then the government would be a logical support service for that type of item.

I think there's one other aspect that we haven't really talked about. Most of these Day Care Centres are co-operative in nature and you talk about volunteerism to a large degree needed in society. There is a large degree of volunteerism of people involved and when you have that, it seems to me that the government should be really going out of their way to support that volunteerism to provide the infrastructure necessary so those people don't become absolutely, totally frustrated with the system.

That also leads to the other question and once again, back to profit. People are prepared to put their time and effort into the operation of those Day Care Centres to have top quality. When you take it back to profit, you've lost something once again. It's not theirs now, it's for the determination of how much of a buck you can make off of kids.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms Phillips

MS M. PHILLIPS: One more, Mr. Chairperson. I'd like to ask you some questions about workplace Day Care. You mentioned earlier that your position was to be an advocate and obviously I accept that in terms of your coming and telling us all the things that we should be

doing. You don't care where we get the money, just get it, because the need is there and I think you presented your case quite well. I think we recognize that that overwhelming need is there, but I guess I want to throw something back at you.

How many workplace Day Care Centres have unions in this province got into their contract?

MR. D. MARTIN: I can't tell you; we haven't made a survey of that. Very few.

MS M. PHILLIPS: What I'm suggesting is that I think we are quite willing to do our job and work very hard to try to get the best Day Care program in the country. I guess I'm just saying it is a responsibility that needs a lot of sharing in the community. We called the name of the Act, The Community Child Day Care Standards Act. We have a lot of voluntary Boards that are interested in doing their share to make sure that happens. I think that there's a role to play for the MFL and the unions to put some emphasis. If you're saying this has to be a top priority for us, I would like to see it being a top priority for the MFL and the unions in the province as well.

MR. D. MARTIN: Well, in response I'd like to make it a top priority, Mrs. Phillips, but let me tell you in these days we're negotiating for survival.

MS M. PHILLIPS: You mean you have other problems too?

MR. D. MARTIN: Yes, we have a few other problems.

MS B. RUSSELL: Could I just say one thing? I think it comes back to the triangle. It's the government, the job world and the parents - the job world including the community - and it's something that can be done together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On Page 8 of the submission you have stated that you are opposed to profit Day Care because it might lead to ghettoization and a two-class of society - the haves and the have-nots. In addition to that, do you consider it morally abhorrent, in general, for any private enterpriser to make profit out of basic human needs?

MR. D. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as a general philosophy, we don't think that Day Care should be treated as just another thing to merchandise in the marketplace to make a dollar off. So, consequently, that is really the basic premise that we're opposed to profit Day Care. And, you know, we're talking about our children. What really kind of gets to me is that we're talking about our children and we're talking about making a dollar off of children. I don't think that's proper.

MR. C. SANTOS: If that is basic, it must also apply to other types of social services such as, for example, supervising nursing homes for the aged and for the crippled. Would you say the same thing to commercial establishments for senior citizens?

MR. D. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any other questions for the delegation? Thank you very much, Mr. Martin and Ms Russell.

MR. D. MARTIN: Thank you.

MS P. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next we have Mr. Laurie Todd.

MR. L. TODD: Thank you. As parents utilizing Child Care facilities, we are pleased with the introduction of Bill 21, but concerned with the lack of distinction between preschool and school-age Child Care.

Although many of us utilize both types of Child Care and appreciate their complementary nature and in our case the close proximity, we are unhappy with them being lumped together under Child Care which most assume is preschool. This represents to us, as parents, a lack of understanding at the government level, of the type of programming we are trying to provide. Falling under the general title of Child Care does not reflect the different needs of children in the 6 to 12 year age groups, or the discrepancies in funding between the two programs, which is crippling many small BNAS programs.

Perhaps this consolidation is in part due to our name, Earl Grey Lunch and After School Program, which implies supervisory care only, and does not reflect our philosophy or range of programming and social responsibilities we have all come to associate with the term Child Care.

Our Centre is open and staffed from 7:00 in the morning to 6:00 in the evening. Programming and preparation are carried out while the children are attending classes. On in-service days and school breaks such as Christmas, spring break and summer holidays, we provide full-day Child Care.

Our Centre is in the process of planning our summer program. During the months of July and August, we will be open from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. We will be providing the children of this area with a wide range of activities such as nature hikes; cultural activities; ethnic lunches; swimming lessons; arts and crafts; camping; day trips and cooking.

As you can see we provide much more than just lunch-time supervision. We therefore feel that changing our name to school age Child Care would reflect the full diversity of our services and enable us to achieve more appropriate funding.

Presently our preschool and school age Child Care are both housed in Earl Grey Community School. Our school has long recognized the value of community input by the teacher's aid positions, which are held by community members, and we stress that the balance school age Child Care must maintain between school and home, make it essential that this type of position be encouraged and not inhibited by the qualifications standards in the new Act.

One recurring problem which has been expressed at our board meetings is the need for 24 hour Child Care. The following letter typifies the predicament of

many parents finding themselves in. On the following page, it reads as follows:

"As a single parent of two school age children, I would like to comment on the proposed legislation affecting Day Care. The present system of Child Care severely limits my job opportunities. As a registered nurse, there are few jobs open to me which are Monday to Friday with weekends off. If I took a job requiring shift work or weekend work, my Child Care costs would rise substantially, as I am obligated by the present system to pay for a full-time slot for the children to ensure the space would be available when I was on day shift. I would have to pay additional Child Care costs for any weekend or shift work. Thus my costs for the day care would be very high, or I would be forced to place my children in private care and they would lose out on the benefits of a Lunch and After School Program.

"To further complicate the matter these extra costs are not presently calculated in the eligibility for subsidy because the cost would be so high I would probably be over the allowable limit for Day Care deductions on my income tax.

"Legislation should be altered to assist parents working shift work and weekends. I also believe Day Care Centres should be open weekends for those parents who have to work. To avoid abuse of this service parents would be allowed to use the Centre a maximum number of days averaging 20 working days a month.

"Lunch and After School Programs should be given adequate funding as they receive substantially less than preschool Day Care where their costs are comparable.

"To give our children the best possible care we must pay our Day Care staff adequately. There must also be funding made available to provide education in school-aged Day Care and appropriate accredited courses must be developed.

"I also believe that, since many of our schools have ample space, rooms should be made available for the programs in our schools.

"Respectfully submitted. L. Whitford."

We hope that the government will be responsive to these needs by establishing, if not a 24-hour Child Care facility, at least an off-hour Centre. In the interim period we feel that the government should recognize the cost of private care during non-operating times of conventional Child Care Centres. This would be achieved by changes in The Income Tax Act which would allow parents to claim all Child Care costs.

As a representative of parents from the Earl Grey Lunch and After School Program I would make the following recommendations:

1. That our name be changed to reflect more fully our services and programming.
2. Under Section 1, a definition of School-age Child Care.
3. Section 27, Child Care Staff Qualifications Review Committee. Representation should include parents and staff members from School-age Child Care.
4. Section 29, Room for community involvement, such as, Winnipeg School Division No. 1 uses of community members as teachers' aides.
5. Section 33, specific regulations for school age Child Care independent of any other type of care

already described in the Act.

6. That the Act not be passed until regulations have been drafted and submitted for public input.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Todd. Are there any questions of Mr. Todd?

Yes, Ms Phillips.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, I'd just like to say that it's my understanding that the Act gets passed in the House and then the regulations are developed and it can't be proclaimed until the regulations are developed.

MR. L. TODD: Okay, fine.

MS M. PHILLIPS: You're mainly concerned about school-age children, I gather?

MR. L. TODD: Yes, we are.

MS M. PHILLIPS: You feel that the Act does not address that problem specifically enough, is that what you're concerned about?

MR. L. TODD: Yes, as I say the needs of School-age Child Care are quite different from the preschool. As you can see the preschool is from two to five, and the other one is six to 12. I think anyone who has had small children will realize that the development that children go through in these different age groups are very very different, and we feel that the Act should make specific recommendations or have specific sections that apply directly to each section of preschool and school age.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?
Ms Phillips.

MS M. PHILLIPS: The Act covers Child Care for children under 12. So the regulations would then outline programming and staff ratios, etc. for children in different age groups, so do you not feel that would be adequate? I mean, if the regulations for the age group from six to 12 certainly would be different than for, say, zero to two.

MR. L. TODD: The reason we bring this point up is that in the drafting of the Act there was no distinction given between preschool and school age, and we were very concerned that this may be overlooked in the drafting of regulations.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, the only place I could see would be in 3(2) where it talks about programming, that there be an amendment to say age-specific programming, or age-relevant programming, or something like that. Then the regulations would deal with what program would be appropriate to children of a certain age group; would that be satisfactory?

MR. L. TODD: Yes, as long as it is stressed there our distinctions between preschool and school age. As I say, we don't want an umbrella covering everything,

that there may be specific requirements for school age that would be overlooked.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, we'll take that into account in the regulations for sure.

MR. L. TODD: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Todd. Mr. Todd, how would you envision that 24-hour Child Care facility operating? For example, when we talk about shift workers, if I was working the graveyard shift, for example, would you envision this operating in such a way that my children slept there in that 24-hour Centre, or the other way, that a Child Care worker would be dispatched to come into my home and look after my children?

MR. L. TODD: I think ideally it would be that the government should establish 24-hour Centres, per se. They should provide facilities so that the child would be able to maintain a regular schedule and not have to have his schedule disrupted because his parents are working shift work. So that these Centres, yes, would have proper sleeping accommodations for the children. Now, how I would like to envision it is possibly set up on a regional level which could possibly be done by some of the already established programs being further funded so that they could make the changes necessary to run on a 24-hour basis, hiring extra staff and provide the facilities for such care.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Then it certainly couldn't be done on the basis of one such Centre, because obviously shift workers are as desperate through society as any other type.

MR. L. TODD: Yes, that is true, I agree with that, but I think initially to just get a 24-hour Centre going I think would be a good step in the right direction.

MR. L. SHERMAN: What are your views with respect to an earlier submission that was made to the committee and, in fact, a point raised by a colleague of mine, the Member for St. Norbert, in the House on Second Reading debate on this bill, that suggested, at least from the perspective of a first-stage arrangement, a babysitting subsidy for shift workers? What are your views on something like that?

MR. L. TODD: That would be a help, but again, I think if we're going to go into the area, as I say, a babysitting subsidy, it would be nice to have some regulations drafted so that, if people are going to use these services, there would be some sort of qualifications of the people coming in, but very definitely, yes; subsidization of babysitting costs, yes, is necessary, as well as being able to use those possible costs for subsidy as well.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Todd. I guess the point is that there appear to be a good number of gaps in needs and requirements, and there is going to be a limited number of dollars to meet those requirements.

Although the concept that you propose is probably unquestionably desirable, it probably would be one of the more expensive initiatives to undertake at this point in time, but there could be some sort of first-step substitute in that direction, such as, consideration of the babysitting arrangement. You'd be satisfied that would be at least a positive first step?

MR. L. TODD: I would agree with that, but reiterate that would be a very very minimal first step. I would think that is just the absolute sort of bottom line we could start with.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you.

MR. L. TODD: You're welcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions for Mr. Todd. Seeing none, thank you very much Mr. Todd for your presentation.

MR. L. TODD: Your welcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next is Norma Buchan

MRS. N. BUCHAN: I'm Norma Buchan and I'm speaking for the Community Task Force on Maternal and Child Health, and I would like to relieve you all by saying that I will be very brief. The Task Force as you know has recently published its paper on a plan for Maternal and Child Health Care in Manitoba and we do make a couple of specific recommendations for the need for Day Care, one being a general statement that we need to assess and develop alternative systems to support working parents and to ensure the development of healthy children, and an example we cite of how an alternative that might be effective is that of on-site Day Care.

I think though what we want to emphasize today are two special needs areas which the Task Force recognized and emphasized in its paper, one being that of infant Day Care, recognizing that approximately 40 percent of women return to work when the 16-week Unemployment Insurance benefits are over. There's a real shortage of the licenced infant Day Care both in home or in an institutional setting. The majority of these children then go into private Day Care settings which are nonlicensed, nonsupervised and non-subsidized.

Infant Day Care then, is very much a priority for all families but especially for the other group which we have identified, that of the adolescent mother. Although the ideal, of course, would be not to have adolescent mothers, they do occur and we need to be developing special programs for their needs.

The real area that we have emphasized is that of continuing education and we're suggesting that there needs to be joint Day Cares possibly in the school system and in the high school so that these girls can continue their education through to the end of Grade 12. While the task force focused on pre-pregnancy, pregnancy, labour and delivery, and infant care in the first year of life, we purposely did not spend a lot of time looking at the Day Care issues because we knew of very active confident groups in the community who were doing just that. We do support the need for qual-

ity Day Care for all young children as would begin and as established through Bill 21. We wish to stress the need for increased licensing and increased funding for the Day Care for infants and particularly for the adolescent mother.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Buchan. Are there any questions for Mrs. Buchan? Thank you very much for your presentation, Madam.

MRS. N. BUCHAN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is Fay Ferris present? Ms Ferris, go ahead please.

MS F. FERRIS: I'm a member of the Board of Directors of Wee World Day Care in Portage la Prairie. I'll just give a brief background. Since 1975 Wee World Day Care in Portage la Prairie has been providing both preschool and group infant care to our community. The group infant care program was commenced in direct response to a need in our community, and over the five year period use of the facility has been steady with the fluctuating waiting list in both preschool and infant care.

In the year 1981, 60 infants used the infant care spaces. At the beginning of this year, we were faced with a projected deficit of \$26,000 in infant care and \$12,000 overall for the Centre. Our staff budget is 92 percent of that total, so as you can see there aren't too many areas left where we can cut back our costs. As a Board of Directors, we were concerned with providing and maintaining a group infant care program in our community, quality infant care, and at that point in time we were faced with the possibility of closing our infant care program.

I formed a committee from the Board of Directors and with a group from the community and we presented a Brief to the government on March 17th. As a result of our research and the findings for that Brief, our concern is that group infant care needs to be placed either in the area of special needs or the basic maintenance grant for group infant care licensed spaces must be increased.

We have many letters of support that are included in our Brief. The service is being constantly used by students; by those involved in job training programs; by single parents; by working parents; by special needs children. I'm talking about the infant care program here. So that our services providing the need in the community. It's providing a choice for users, some of whom have tried Family Day Care situations and have not been satisfied.

We are also concerned about quality. In Portage la Prairie there isn't an alternative at the moment for infant care in licensed family Day Care spaces. As of two days ago, there were 10 Family Day Care units in Portage la Prairie and 4 of them were taking infants. One of the things that concerns us as a Board of Directors is that our staff ratios in infant care in the Centre require 1 worker to 3.3 infants. In a Family Day Care situation where a person can have up to 8 children, she can also have 3 children under the age of 2, so we're concerned there.

We welcome the government's actions so far with

the increased maintenance grants that were announced earlier this year and also the present Day Care Act and the implementation of standards, etc. We're presently charging at the Centre the maximum of \$9.50 a day, and in order to keep going just for this year, we're looking at having to go back to the parents of the infants again and collect another dollar, perhaps the extra dollar. In many rural Centres there are less alternatives than there are, say, in a city like Winnipeg or even Brandon, yet I'm aware of a Day Care Centre in Brandon who is licensed for 3 infant care spaces and who, in fact, has a waiting list for 30 infants.

At our Centre we are presently forming a three-year plan and one of the things we've tried to do is involve the community in the problems of the Day Care Centre and they have, in fact, been very supportive. The letters that are enclosed with our Brief will address that support and that concern. We feel that one way that the community can continually assist us is that if we at some point try to obtain a building or space that we can use to operate our Day Care Centre, then the community can be involved in fund raising and maintaining of that building. We're presently paying \$650 a month in rent to a local church for our Centre. The two other Centres that operate in our community are paying \$350, so definitely we need to look at that.

We support the standards outlined by the Coalition. We also obviously are going to be faced with an increasing deficit with the standards and regulations as they come up. Our staff obviously are going to - some of them are already fairly well qualified, but as their qualifications increase then our staff budget is going to increase. We are at this point in time deciding whether before the end of this year, we have to cut back 10 of our 20 licensed infant care spaces. Obviously without some financial assistance or a recognized increase in the basic maintenance grant for infant care, we definitely will have to look seriously at the end of this year at discontinuing the infant care program altogether in our community.

The Board in the last five years, and so have the staff, have put tremendous effort into keeping the thing going. During our research for the brief and during our involvement with many of the community groups and others, accountants would look at our budgets and say, well, I don't know how you did this but, you know, you did okay, you did well; or, if you think you're going to be able to manage on this budget you're crazy, sort of thing. Well, we know we are, but we're trying to meet and provide the quality infant care in our community.

There was a point made earlier about the involvement of volunteers in Day Care programs at all levels, and definitely they have a place. But it's our experience at Wee World that we are finding volunteers more difficult to get hold of. If we do have volunteers involved in our program at all levels they need training, they need supervision and they need direction in order for them to be part of the team and maintain the quality care which we are trying to produce.

I just finally would like to share with you just two letters of support from our collection simply because they express far better than I ever could the feelings of some of the users of our particular service. This one is: "To Whom it may concern . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before you start, if you wish to sit down you may to finish your presentation. I think you'll feel more comfortable that way. I didn't want to interrupt the flow of your presentation.

MS F. FERRIS: Thank you. This first letter says: "I am writing this letter to tell you that without the Infant Care Wee World Day Care I would probably still be receiving Social Assistance instead of supporting myself and my children by working as a nurse at Portage General Hospital.

"If I had not been able to place my one-month old son in Wee World in February of 1981, I would not have been able to take my LPN training that I recently graduated from. I would not even consider placing my two children in a Family Day Care or getting a private babysitter because of the bad experiences I had with the types of Child Care when my three-year old son was an infant.

"Wee World has been such a big part of Jason's life up to now that I feel if I had to take Jason out, because the Infant Day Care closed, it would have a very detrimental effect on my son's emotional well-being.

"My oldest son, Cory, was on the infant side of Wee World for one year and I could not ask for better care for my children."

Then she goes on to say that she hopes something can be done to keep the infant side of Wee World Day Care open. That's one letter.

This one is, and I'm reading this exactly as it was written: "My little girl had been going to Day Care because so I can find a job. I think it really good for because when she was being growing up, she never had been with children her own age. I think Day Care is learning her a lot of things, better than what I could teach her myself. She to be happy playing with other kids. It sort of give her a change to adjust to be with children her age. She is two now and has been in Day Care since January. I have finded that her being in Day Care has helped me deal with her more better. She used to be very cranky but since she's been in Day Care she has been come more and more happy. She also seems to like going to Day Care because she very excited in the morning when I tell her we are going to day care. I like her in Day Care as well; I'm trying so hard to be a good parent to her. She doesn't have a father, but I'm finding it hard to mother and father at the same time, so Wee World is good for her and good for me."

The writer of this letter, in fact, is a mentally retarded mother and the child was admitted because of the special needs and has improved tremendously while she has been at the Centre.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ms Ferris. Are there any questions from the Committee?
Mr. Evans.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank Ms Ferris of the Wee World Day Care Centre for the presentation and I guess you've heard the questions that I put to some of the other delegates as to what percentage of the funding, whatever additional funding we are able to obtain for these programs and for the administration of this new Act, what percen-

tage would you put toward expanding facilities and what percentage would you put toward raising standards. I gather, obviously, your response would be to certainly put a great amount of money in toward Infant Care and, therefore, to the raising - you'd tend to incline toward the raising of standards rather than increasing the number of spaces in the province?

MS F. FERRIS: I recognize that there is a need for both and I'm glad I don't have to make the decision about, you know, never mind where the money goes when it's found, but I definitely would like to see some increase, say, in the basic maintenance grant for infants as a priority for spaces that is presently available and also perhaps some expansion in available group Infant Care spaces. In addition to the present thrust, which I'm aware of, of the efforts made by the government at the moment to increase the availability of Family Day Care spaces, but my concern, like I've already said, in the Family Day Care is to see, perhaps, some change in the ratios there. I would be concerned about safety and quality in a Family Day Care setting, with the ratios as they are at the moment and as they are outlined in the Act.

HON. L. EVANS: In the efforts to increase quality, certainly you would put a priority on providing more funding for Infant Care. I think I'm inclined to agree with you. We recognize that there is a growing need to meet Infant Care in whatever setting, and I gather that would be a top priority with you.

MS F. FERRIS: It would with me, yes, simply because - just speaking from our point of view from Wee World Day Care - at the present time we are looking at closing what spaces we have and it seems to me that, if there's been an overall effort involved in establishing and maintaining the spaces, it would be rather foolish to see them be discontinued simply because of a lack of funding.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions of Ms Ferris?

Thank you very much for coming to town. I certainly appreciate your attendance here today.

Next, could I call on Marianne Haddad.

Mrs. Haddad.

MRS. M. HADDAD: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, good. I wasn't sure if you were going to be able to make it this afternoon.

MRS. M. HADDAD: I'm here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Great. That's good. Thank you very kindly.

MRS. M. HADDAD: I'm Director of Wild Honey Children Centre and also a concerned parent. I don't have a written brief, but I have several concerns in regard to the bill that I'd like to ask some questions to.

First off, I think, I'd like to answer a question that I've heard asked several times in regard to how the funds

should be directed into Day Care, if and when there's a choice to be made as to where the funds should be going. I don't think there's a choice as to how the funds should be divided. Definitely there needs to be an increase in the Day Care Program. One in the lack of licensed spaces that are available right now, being for Day Care-aged children and school-aged children, and also in Infant Care. There is also a definite need; Child Care Committee has been working on since 1974, if not earlier, the need for standards. How you decide to draw an equality between what is most important and what is the priority between the need, I think is not the issue, it's definitely going to be recognized that there is going to be additional funding required in the program, and it's going to have to be determined from where it's going to come from. What is the priority given as to Day Care being identified as an educational program, a Preventative Care program, or is it a welfare-type program? Being a preventative program, putting funding into the program now, rather than 10 years or 15 years down the road and having additional institutions being built for children, who are then adults, who have not been given the direction that they required at the very important age, which is now, in the preschool and early learning years, that they end up being lead astray, having to live off the street because of lack of proper direction being given; whether it be the fault of the parent, because of their lack of education; lack of services being made available, however, you know, lack of public education, however that's to be identified as.

I think it's not a very easy decision to make as to where the levels of percentages should be made as to where the funds should be directed to. But, being in Day Care for several years, it's been a hard grind maintaining a level of program which I feel, to some degree, that is given by most Day Care Centres in the program has to be a quality program; but definitely lacking for a strong structure of guidelines and regulations as set out by the Coalition for Day Care and by the MCCA, and also that was presented by the School-age Children Program.

There definitely needs to be some regulations set and a combining of where the service is coming from. It's being divided now with the city and the province and it becomes very cumbersome, in terms of anyone aligning to setting up a new program - the definition of by-laws and regulations and how they're being interpreted and who is interpreting them to you. It's very frustrating and it ends up costing a lot of unnecessary kinds of monies to the program, being the direct Day Care program and to the program as a whole, the Day Care program. And how the funds are utilized in the present program right now, I think there needs to be a definition in terms of allotments of funding within the budgets for the Day Care Centre. There needs to be allotments of monies for building.

The balance of how the budget is to be used varies so widely between Day Care programs. Because of the size of the programs, if there's 60 to 80 children, there is a little bit more flexibility as to how much may be able to be spent in the area of building, or salary, or program. When you look at a smaller program, which we have, which is 24 you are looking at - and the same being with programs between 25 to 30; 30 to 35 revenue-wise is a good optimum for generating the

kind of revenue for a balanced program. But I guess the point that I'm getting is that the monies that are allocated out for the different blocks of program, as laid out in budget, needs to be looked at a little bit more closely. Depending on the program and where they are located, and the number of square footage that is involved, you may be paying, depending what area of the city you are - the rate varies - where one may cost \$3,900 for a year and someone else may be paying \$6,000. There's an imbalance there and I think there needs to be a levelling-off of that to draw in a little bit more cohesively, in terms of the overall budget.

The same with salaries; in terms of when the regulations will be brought in place, which I can appreciate will take several years, I don't think anyone in the Day Care community expects this to happen next year; we can realize that - appreciate that overall procedure and process is going to take a while; hopefully, not another 10 years. But it will take another few years for everything to be budgeted for and allowed for, but there has to be minimal regulations and I mean minimal that they be not any less than that's been presented now; that will be a working structure that will provide for quality care within the province overall, and that's taking in the outlying regions also, as well as in the city.

There definitely has to be a clarification on what is happening on nonprofit Day Care and commercial-oriented programs. I'm not saying that I've heard the opposing comments made to why should not commercial Day Care have a place in the community. Well, they should have a place in the community but I think that they should not be providing any difference in the type of quality care that nonprofit programs should be. If the money that's coming in is channeled out as profit, and the program is suffering, and the parent is paying that money in and they're paying more in that program than they are in the nonprofit programs, I think that's deplorable. The program is hurting and maybe not hurting - I don't want to make it sound in a derogatory sense - I guess what I really want to say is that the quality of program that's required for nonprofit organizations should be required for the commercial programs and there be no cutting down the road at all of that. It's got to be very explicit.

If it comes down the road that somebody wants to open an existing commercial Day Care and a nonprofit program, then I think the priority should go to the nonprofit organization. Subsidy spaces are at a premium; there's programs that need to expand. I have a waiting list all year round and that's not just one year - three, four years in a row and the program has been in existence six years - of between 20 to 30 people, children on a waiting list and I am in the process of phoning back. I've got people that have been waiting since late September, October, that still need Day Care; either they want to get into the work force but because there's nothing available, they cannot, they're waiting. They're sitting at home waiting. They may have, for whatever reasons, maybe they can't afford to plug into private sitters at home; maybe that's not what they want for their child. I'm not really sure what their personal reasons are. Those are some of the questions I've heard.

One other comment. When the gentleman from Earl

Grey was speaking in terms of the 24 hour care, a thought that came to mind and I hadn't given much thought before about it, but why could not consideration be given to the 24 hour program be done in terms of the Child Care staff be an extension of a licensed program? That staff person could be a licensed or a qualified person, an outreach person from a Day Care program and be considered to provide Child Care in the individual's home, ideally until at such point that a 24 hour program is ready to be set up in the province.

There are 24 hour programs running in Ontario and I know there's a lot of concerns about that and it really would have to come under close scrutiny as to how that would be handled. But in terms of staffing or the use of staff persons, or personnel going out and looking after or providing that 24 hour care, they should be persons that are qualified and that could be done as being an extension of an existing Day Care program, as an outreach person. And also that there should be subsidy available to the families that require the 24 care, so that it's not a financial burden; so that a person is not placed in a predicament in having to give up their job in lieu of not having adequate care for their child.

In regards to the bill, under Responsibility for Providing Proper Environment, 3(2) Responsibility for Program Activities, I think there needs to be a broadened requirement as to what program itself should be labeled as. What should programs be made up of? I think there should a guideline similar to what is set out in the kindergarten guidelines. Our program is not a structured program but I feel that, so that there's some guidelines for what program requirements should be, there should be some type of guidelines set out as to what should be contained in a good quality program; developing the intellectual abilities of the child; being aware of their emotional needs - just that whole thing. Leaving it there and not having some broader guidelines for what program activity should be containing, I think is clarifying what would be required from a Day Care Centre, or a care giving program whether it be infant care, Day Care, child age, or Family Day Care.

Family Day Care, I can appreciate that the resources available to them are not the same as group care and I think there needs to be more support system available to them, in terms so that if the person that is providing Family Day Care is going to be required to be an educated individual, in terms of meeting with the regulations that are going to be required, then there's going to have to be a support system set up for that person to be able to come out into the community, obtain the type of education that would be required to bring themselves up to that level or standard that would be required by the regulations.

Under 6(1) Licence Required: "No person shall operate or maintain a Day Care Centre or occasional Day Care Centre or Group Day Care or Family Day Care home unless the person holds a valid and subsisting licence to do so issued by the Director." How will that be assessed? Will that be assessed by the review committee? I would assume that licensing - is that for the licensing of the overall Centre or is that licensing for the Directors and persons, or the Director of the Centre? I would assume that's the licensing of the program then and that would be done by the review committee, I suppose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to pause for a second? Ms Phillips.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, I am writing down your comments and I can wait until you're finished.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It may be better actually.

MRS. M. HADDAD: Under section 7, in regards to business licence. Right now Day Care Centres are not required to pay business licence - yes, are not required to pay a business licence. I'm wondering why that's included in there? If it's in there it should be clarified for what purpose that's going to be. My feeling is if somewhere down the road there's going to be felt a need that Day Care Centres are going to be assessed a business licence I don't think that's very appropriate. There should also be a clarification between non-profit groups and commercial programs.

In regard to Nos. 15, 16, and 17, the interim licence, that if any program be issued an interim licence, that the parents using that program should be notified of such. I do not think it would be fair to any user of that program not be aware that an interim licence, for whatever reason it might be, hopefully, that the parents of that Centre would be knowledgeable that Centre is being given just an interim licence. But that's resting assured that the Day Care would take that responsibility to do so. I think that responsibility would come from the administrative body, whether it be the review committee or whoever; but the parents in the program need to be notified if the program is given an interim licence, that they be aware of that and know what the terms of that interim licensing is. So if there is something that's happening within that program that's a concern, should be a concern to them and their child, you know, for them and their child, then they should be totally aware of that.

In regard to 26(1), An Appointment of a Provisional Administrator. I guess I'm interested in what type of instances that would have to be required in and how someone would be appointed to take over the management of that existing program.

In reference to the Review Committee on 27(1), I would like to stress, and I would assume that we've taken for granted, but the persons that be on the Review Committee be knowledgeable persons within the Day Care community, that have worked in the field; representation from the province. That they be aware of the total need of the entire Day Care Program, being Family Day Care; Child Care Program, from two to five; the school age program from six to twelve; and the Infant Program and that there be a good overview of the knowledge that would be making up that Review Committee. I would assume that would happen.

Those are the only concerns I had in terms of Bill 21, in terms of the regulations that are set out.

I would, at this point, like to express how pleased I am to see that we have come this far along and been able to come to the stage where we are looking at a Bill being set up to look after the needs for Child Care and I hope that there not be a rush in this happening. We've waited this long, there's no urgency, it's important that, I think, the umbrella be set in place, the structure be set in place that the guidelines and regu-

lations can be worked within; but I think it's very important that the efforts are being done now, in terms of getting input from the community. I would hope that would continue to happen further down the line so that there's clarity made of the different issues and concerns of the community.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much Mrs. Haddad. Ms Phillips, do you have some commentary to start it off?

MS M. PHILLIPS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. You commented at the beginning about a concern you had about licensing and split jurisdictions. Well, in the Act, what we've done is standardizing a licensing procedure throughout the province . . .

MRS. M. HADDAD: Yes, I realize that.

MS M. PHILLIPS: . . . and specifically for the reasons that you mentioned.

You talked about the quality between Group homes and Family homes, I think, having to be the same . . .

MRS. M. HADDAD: No, no.

MS M. PHILLIPS: . . . between commercial and non-profit, etc.

MRS. M. HADDAD: Right.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Well, also in the Act, commercial Centres will have to meet these standards so I think that concern has been addressed in the Act. All Day Care Centres, whether they be commercial or non-profit or co-ops, have to meet the standards in this legislation.

I think your idea about Outreach people is something that's really interesting. I'd like to explore that later with you during the next year or so as we're developing Estimate procedures, that kind of thing, because that would be a funding consideration.

I just want to make it clear, when you're talking about licensing, the provisions under this Act, the kinds of things like the details of programming will be outlined in the regulations. For instance, you compared it to the Kindergarten Program. In The Public Schools Act, you don't have 20 pages with the program for Kindergarten and the program for Grade 1 and the program for Grade 2. Those are all in regulations and developed. So this is enabling legislation to enable us to do that. Now, when a Day Care Centre applies for a licence under 6(1), you read that Section?

MRS. M. HADDAD: Right.

MS M. PHILLIPS: A licence will be granted by the Day Care office under the provisions of the regulation which will include, not just the physical facilities like your licence that you already have requires from the City - it just talks about fire standards and health standards and that kind of thing - but it will include the physical standards that will be outlined in the regulations, the program standards that we just talked about and also the staff qualifications. So a Centre will have

to meet those components to be issued a license.

MRS. M. HADDAD: If I might just comment, I can appreciate that in the presentation that was done by the Coalition and by the MCCA that there were some program components set out. I think they even need to be more explicit.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Surely, yes.

MRS. M. HADDAD: I think they're just minimal.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Sure. That will be our next stage.

The concern you had about Section 7, about the Business Licence. That's, where applicable, and so it would depend on the jurisdiction. Say, for instance, some city determined in their By-laws that a business licence was necessary.

MRS. M. HADDAD: That would be assessed against a non-profit organization also?

MS M. PHILLIPS: Well, I have no idea what the City of Thompson decides to do tomorrow at City Council. I don't think they can do that. A non-profit Centre doesn't need a business licence.

MRS. M. HADDAD: But I think it needs to be set out in such a way that coup would not be allowed to happen.

MS M. PHILLIPS: I'm not a corporate lawyer or anything, but I don't see where a non-profit or a co-operative organization - I suppose a co-operative, Red River Co-op, might need a business licence. I don't know. This Section would deal with commercial Centres, if a city jurisdiction decided, so that sentence in the Act has to be there to take into account those situations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of Mrs. Haddad?

MS M. PHILLIPS: Section 13, the concern about interim licensing and notifying parents.

MRS. M. HADDAD: Yes.

MS M. PHILLIPS: We felt that was taken care of. It wasn't 16, that's interim licence.

MRS. M. HADDAD: 15, 16 and 17.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Section 13 is the posting of licensing.

MRS. M. HADDAD: Okay.

MS M. PHILLIPS: So every Day Care Centre must have the licence posted in an accessible place so that if it were an interim licence, that would also have to be posted.

MRS. M. HADDAD: Would it state the provisions of what the interim . . .

MS M. PHILLIPS: It would state it would be an interim

licence versus a regular licence. Do you still think that we would need to amend that other section to say that parents would have to be notified? First of all, if someone comes to a Day Care Centre to enquire about whether they want to leave their child there we don't know who that parent is so we can't very well write that parent and say, before you consider putting your child there, we want to let you know that Centre only has an interim licence until such and such a date. The interim licence would be posted; the parent would see that and know. Is that not adequate?

MRS. M. HADDAD: Okay, possibly that the interim licence be posted and pending the improvements of such-and-such and such-and-such, you know, whatever the requirements are to upgrade that program, maybe they should be stated also. Then that would be quite visible, it would be quite explanatory. Then if they do notice, if it be a new parent or an existing parent or I would hope that an existing parent would be aware of that, you know that's somebody in the program.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Section 16, Mr. Chairperson, in terms of provisional licence, the mechanism for setting that into place would also be in the regulation.

MRS. M. HADDAD: Yes, I was including 15, 16 and 17 inclusive of that.

MS M. PHILLIPS: That would be set in the regulations, too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Evans.

HON. L. EVANS: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman. I want to congratulate Mrs. Haddad. I think, if I recall correctly, she is the first delegate to appear before this Committee to go over various parts of the bill clause-by-clause and to give us some of her thoughts which we all appreciate, so congratulations.

You observed that there was some advantage in being large. I don't want to put words in your mouth, but as you were saying I think, conveyed to me at least, that the larger Centres were, in a sense, better off than the smaller Centres because they had a bigger volume, a bigger throughput so your average costs are reduced by that nature and therefore they'd do better under a program than the smaller Centres.

I would gather then that you would be in favour - maybe you'd like to comment on this - of, I guess you could call it a flat-rate grant. Let me give you an example. At the present time we - and I'm just using one example - support activity Centres for handicapped people and there are various ways of helping those activity Centres on a per diem basis, but we've come up now with a \$10,000 flat grant across the board whether you're large or small and obviously the \$10,000 means a lot more to the smaller ones who are actually suffering. They're having a more difficult time to make ends meet in the larger Centres, so this is what I'm talking about. Would you be in favour of that approach to assist the smaller Centres?

MRS. M. HADDAD: I guess it would depend on what the overall funding itself would entail. How would that

be proportionate to the overall revenue for the program? When I the advantage of a larger program versus - to me, it's proven to be more advantageous to have had an enrolment of 30 rather than 24 which is what we're licensed for. Just because the additional revenues generated by those additional six children enable you to offset your operating expenses a lot better.

The concern I had brought up was about building and rent being paid out. It seems that we're at the mercy of the community in terms of goodwill approaches to how you are given an allocated space. In most occasions church basements, which is not the most ideal setting, which is quite obvious in terms of, you know, going out and viewing a lot of Centres. You manage to operate and function quite well in that setting but meanwhile the goodwill sort of goes so far as to in terms of how the renter views the value of your program. Do they look at you in terms of fund raising, in generating funds for their own profit or for their own needs, or in terms of the value to the community? I think when it comes to weighing out the operating costs of buildings and that, I'm afraid to say that the community aspect and the human needs tend to come second. We are looking over our budget for building and being in one program maybe like, say, \$3,900; someone else may be paying \$6,000 for the same space.

Going back to what you're asking, it would really depend on what the overall connotation of funding would be. I think in terms of building expense, something that we really do not have control of and it's more or less dictated to us by other persons, by the outside. You don't have the flexibility in being able to say, well, the rent is too high here, we'll move down the street. There aren't those kind of facilities made available.

HON. L. EVANS: Perhaps I should clarify, I was talking about the flat-rate grant, Mr. Chairman, that would go really unconditionally. It would be available to the Centre for use in the operation of the Centre. Let's say, \$5,000 across the board for everyone, whether you had 10, 20, 30 - regardless. It would be a given lump sum. Well, last winter . . .

MRS. M. HADDAD: To the discretion of the program?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. Last winter we provided a special grant of \$1,000 for every facility regardless of the size . . .

MRS. M. HADDAD: For the repair grant.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. So this is what I was talking about. Something like that, an unconditional grant. You know, assuming your operating a bona fide licensed Centre or facility.

MRS. M. HADDAD: In addition to your maintenance grant?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, in addition to maintenance grants and . . .

MRS. M. HADDAD: Well, that would certainly offset

some of those uncertain types of operating costs. I think that would definitely be an asset, would be worth consideration, yes.

HON. L. EVANS: So, you're agreeing with me it would help the smaller Centres as opposed to the larger Centres, obviously.

MRS. M. HADDAD: It would help the overall Day Care community also, yes.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Hammond.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mrs. Haddad asked a couple of questions that haven't been addressed pertaining to 26(1) on the Directors, I believe it was, and in 27(1). I wonder if the Minister would address those questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it would help for clarification, I think I'll let this one go by, but that is normal for clause-by-clause. I think it's basically in the premise of questions she wishes to address to Mrs. Haddad, so I'm permitting this.

Could you repeat the question please, Gerrie?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'll ask Mrs. Haddad to repeat the question, it was on 26(1) and 27.

MRS. M. HADDAD: It was the appointment of a provisional Administrator to, I would assume, an existing program. I'd like know under what circumstances that would happen and how would that Administrator be appointed to the Day Care Program? I would assume that's to an existing Day Care Program that Administrator would have to be replaced. Under what circumstances would you feel that would occur, and how would that replacement of the Administrator or Director would occur?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'd be very happy to answer the question. It is not in accordance with our procedures for the Committee to answer questions on the details of the bill in this respect, but it would be in the case of some disaster. Let's say there was some criminal action that took place, some violent act took place and that the Director was being charged under the Criminal Code of Canada, some drastic situation. Then we would have to ensure for the welfare of the children and the families who are dependant on that facility, to move someone in. That would surely be done in consultation with the Board and it's a matter of an emergency special arrangement — (Interjection) — that's right. Also, as Ms Phillips is suggesting, some flagrant violation of the standards that were put in place, you know, some obvious flagrant violation.

The methods of appointment, you asked that. Well, we would have to find someone who is qualified and simply put them in for that period of time, again, hopefully, working with the board eventually or as early as possible. You can imagine all kinds of situations so it's difficult to imagine every situation — (Interjection) — yes, there are all kinds of reasons this could happen; it's a safety valve sort of thing.

MRS. M. HADDAD: So that would be referred over to the Review Committee and handled by the Review Committee?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, the review that's going to take place in the next few months would essentially be with regard to regulations as referred to in Section 33, as prescribing all kinds of standards for food, health, program content and so on.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, it's getting late in the day. Mr. Tallin has pointed out that Section 18 outlines the conditions where a licence is suspended or revoked or refused and it's itemized there - (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and, of course, there's also provision for an appeal procedure and that's outlined in the Act as well. So that if a person feels that they've been unjustly required to give up their licence; they've been suspended . . .

MRS. M. HADDAD: Am I understanding then that the Director being revoked from being able to operate a Day Care Centre, would be not under the scrutiny of the Review Committee. It would come under who's jurisdiction then? Like who would be doing that? Who would say that person no longer could be the Director of the Day Care Centre? I guess what I'm trying to do is, it seems like there's a Review Committee responsibility, or would be, and then there's another nucleus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm going to give her some leeway here because I don't think the delegate is going to be present when we're doing a clause-by-clause discussion. I think when the people have the interest to come and make presentation before the committee, when they're questioning aspects of the bill, that we should be able to give them some reference to it. So I'm going to rule that it would be in order and if there's - well there's not a point of order, no, but there's one coming probably if it was to continue. So what I'm suggesting that if the Minister could perhaps get back to you at a later date, if you wish, to solve it that way, or . . .

Mr. Corrin.

MR. B. CORRIN: I just want to make the point, for the record, that there was no point of order to which you referred your remarks and I presume they were gratuitous and reflected the will and wish of the Chair and I haven't heard anybody challenge it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It reflected the will and wish of the Chair and the hubbub that was going around the Chair at the time.

Mr. Evans.

HON. L. EVANS: I think that you, as Chairman, and all of us here are desirous of providing as much information as possible but it is not the practise for the delegates to ask the Minister or the members of the Committee questions of explanation. That should or could take place but it's not supposed to take place in this forum at this time. The purpose of these meetings is for delegates to present their views to us and to answer questions of clarification put to the delegates by the members of the Committee, not for the delegates to be asking the members of the Committee for explanations. Obviously we want to provide the

information . . .

MRS. M. HADDAD: My reason for asking is I'd like to make sure I'm interpreting what is being said, properly, and if not then I'll make a point of making myself present when the different clauses are going to be discussed at a further date so that I will have proper clarification if I don't feel like I do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms Phillips, do you want to comment on that?

MS M. PHILLIPS: Yes thank you, Mr. Chairperson. In Section 18(1) where it says, "the Director," under definitions, Director is the Director of the Day Care office, so if the Director feels that all these situations, or one of these situations, are happening, and so therefore is revoking or suspending the license, and perhaps if all the Board of Directors quit and the Day Care quit, and here you've got 20 kids at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, what are you going to do? The Director is going to have to take some action and have provisions. If the Board or the Director decide that's not been done fairly, they can appeal to the Appeal Board which, in the definition, is the Welfare Appeal Board. It's an ongoing Self-service Advisory Board, it's called.

Then, if that Board refuses the appeal, a provisional administrator would be appointed, and we felt that was really important because those parents are working at jobs and have to have that Day Care Centre so we have to keep it operating until other arrangements can be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And I can appreciate that.

MS M. PHILLIPS: So that's why that whole appeal procedure is in there, for a wide variety of emergency situations; so the children aren't out on the street.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Mr. Kovnats.

MR. A. KOVNATS: May Mrs. Haddad be allowed to ask the question just posed by Ms Phillips just at this point so that, if she wishes to answer the question that was posed. I think it was a question, I'm not sure because this is what's been happening all afternoon, Mr. Chairman. So I think Mrs. Haddad should have the opportunity of answering the question if she understood that to be a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Haddad.

MRS. M. HADDAD: I understood what you're saying and you're referring to the Welfare Appeal Committee and that's how that would be . . .

MS M. PHILLIPS: It's in the definition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of Mrs. Haddad by Members of the Committee? Do you have another comment?

Mrs. Haddad.

MRS. M. HADDAD: There is one though, for 27, it was the Review Committee itself. How would that Review Committee, if I may ask, be comprised of? How would

those persons be decided on as to who will be sitting on that committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It states quite clearly that it's appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. It's a government appointment.

MRS. M. HADDAD: For every persons on that committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 27(2). Since we're getting into general discourse and discussion of it, it is quite clear. I was trying to give some liberties in the committee to make the committee a bit more open, it's obvious that it's not working. When we go into clause-by-clause discussion of the bills, that is when the members then address the questions to the Minister and the Minister's Assistant; it is at that time that we get into the sort of discussion that we're getting into right now. These sorts of presentations are for the public to come, make commentary to the committee, so that the government may be apprised of concerns and whatnot that are within the committee. If you have a concern toward the mechanism of appointment, I would suggest that you state your concern rather than getting into a discourse between the committee and yourself as to who it should be made up of; or to give your concerns to Members of the Committee who can raise that when we get to clause-by-clause.

Mrs. Haddad.

MRS. M. HADDAD: I guess what I might add, just to clarify and not run into further technicalities, that I would hope that the Review Committee, whether it be an appointment, would still be comprised of persons from the community that would have a working knowledge of what the Child Care Program should entail at the working level. I can appreciate that the appointment needs to be there where they may be but there needs to be working persons on that committee that they have a working knowledge of that committee, not just paid personnel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Haddad.

MRS. M. HADDAD: Thank you kindly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next person on the list is Louisa Bormann. Go ahead Mrs. Bormann.

MRS. L. BORMANN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, honourable Members of the Committee. My name is Louisa Bormann. I'm the Director of Scotland Mini-Skool. I'm speaking as a private citizen re Bill 21 and an employee of a proprietary-owned Child Care Centre.

My background in the Child Care field is extremely extensive and as follows. From 1967 to 1976, I was a teacher and director of the well-known Winnipeg Montessori School. In 1978, I made my move to the government-sponsored Day Care field, where I became fully acquainted with full Child Care under that system in the capacities of teacher and Director at various Centres. In 1981, I became the administrative Director of the new Waverley Heights Mini-Skool in Fort Garry. This January, at the company's request, I

removed to fill the same position at Scotland Mini-Skool.

I'm not here to speak on behalf of the business ventures of the company, but to respond to Bill 21 as it affects all us in the Child Care field.

Bill 21 as a whole, reads very well and I basically find myself in accord with its contents. The upgrading of staff qualifications is a welcome regulation, however, to many of my staff, a concern as to their ability to stay in the Child Care field. Many staff members are willing to upgrade themselves through courses at the Red River Community College level, if sufficient spaces will be made available and the costs of the courses are kept at a reasonable cost level.

However, there are other workers in the field whose circumstances do not allow them to free themselves to spend additional time pursuing upgrading at that level. You have expressed flexibility in this regard, to let experience and suitability be a large determining factor for many to remain in the Child Care fields.

Within our Centre we provide an eight-week training course to enhance understanding of the basic developmental needs and classroom techniques regarding the various developmental levels of our different age groups under the staff's care. All our room supervisors have the required Child Care qualifications as needed at the present time.

I've had the privilege to meet with Ms Phillips on several occasions to discuss and show her the kind of care and programming the children enrolled in our Centres receive. Bill 21 does not oppose the existence of private Day Care in Manitoba and I applaud that fact, since we are not the only privately-owned and run Day Care in Manitoba. Parents should have the right to choose the kind of Child Care Centre they wish to entrust their children to. Since we are a democracy, I strongly urge the government to ensure that freedom of choice.

Mini-Skools may not have parent Boards, but employ a strong monitoring system to ensure that quality is ensured at all times. Parents are provided with evaluation forms yearly and parent-teacher conferences are held twice yearly to discuss their child's progress amongst other communications that we have with their parents. The Director is at all times available to listen to parents' concerns and act upon them.

I, as a member of the Manitoba Child Care Association, would like to see persons from many of the private Day Care in Manitoba have the opportunity to serve on its committees and certainly have someone from the private Day Care sector be invited to sit on future government regulatory boards. We are all Manitobans and the standard of care we provide for the children of Manitobans is of the utmost concern to us all.

Bill 21 is a good bill and the regulations and amendments to this bill will no doubt reflect the wisdom of our elected government officials. Our children should first and foremost benefit from this legislation and not be used as political pawns.

Thank you. This concludes my brief.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions for Mrs. Bormann? No questions?

MRS. L. BORMANN: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kelvin Seifert, please. Is he present? Dr. Seifert. Next is Steve Ishmael.

Mrs. Elaine Taylor. Go ahead, Mrs. Taylor, as soon as you're ready.

MRS. E. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Members and Ladies and Gentlemen. I represent the United Way of Winnipeg. My name is Elaine Taylor and I'm a volunteer board member of the United Way, serving as Vice President of Agency Relations and Chairman of the Agencies Relations Committee. I also served as the Chairman of the United Way Board Committee to establish Day Care policy for our organization.

The United Way and its predecessors, the Community Chest and the Federated Budget Board have supported group Day Care services in our community since 1922. The Mothers Association Day Nursery was the recipient of community funds during those early years. Since then, 10 agencies in this field have received community funds through the United Way.

In November, 1978, a study on Day Care commissioned by the United Way, co-funded by the Mrs. James A. Richardson Foundation, the Winnipeg Foundation and the United Way of Winnipeg was received a 45-person, widely representative community committee. The study report was the work of a three-person volunteer commission, chaired by Allan Gallagher and including Aleda Turnbull and Harry Monroe. This commission was appointed by, and responsible to, the community committee.

On February 21, 1979, our board approved an official response to the Day Care study report and an accompanying policy on Day Care for the United Way. That policy was revised in April of 1981.

At that time, the United Way said, and I quote, "The United Way agrees with the Community Day Care Study Commission that there is a lack of coherence and definition in legislation and jurisdictional responsibility for Day Care services. The United Way will urge the provincial government to act upon the following recommendation of the commission. A Day Care Act should be enacted with the objective of providing a comprehensive and coherent legal framework for the Provincial Day Care Program. This Act should define both Family and Group Day Care; should define the legal structure of Day Care Centres, basic standards and means of enforcing standards. It should establish procedures and criteria for licensing of all Day Care facilities."

I am here today to commend the government for introducing Bill 21 as a major step in ensuring that families in Manitoba will receive good standards of Child Day Care service. We have noted with interest the increased funding, resources which have been allocated by the Province of Manitoba to the support of Child Care services during the last few years. The enactment of Bill 21 will help to make certain that those resources are used in the best interest of those requiring Child Day Care services. We continue to be concerned with this area of service.

Item 33 dealing with regulations, outlines the many areas for standard-setting which were highlighted in

the Community Day Care Study. We are delighted to hear that those regulations will have public scrutiny and input when they are put forward. We look forward to participating in that.

Again, on behalf of the United Way, I commend you for taking this important step in improving Child Care services for our community and for the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Taylor. Are there any questions for Mrs. Taylor? Seeing none, thank you very much for coming down and making your presentation.

Dr. Joel Kettner. Before you start, Dr. Kettner, we still have, I believe three more presentations to finish off and if we can by 5:30, I'd certainly appreciate it if we could finish up and then tomorrow we'll move into clause-by-clause. That way people won't have to come back a second time, if possible. Thank you.

DR. J. KETTNER: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Members, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm sorry I don't have a brief submitted in advance.

My name is Joel Kettner. I'm currently a resident doctor at the University of Manitoba and I'm currently employed at the Health Sciences Centre where I have three children at the Health Sciences Centre Day Care. I'm speaking here on my own behalf as a user of one of the province's Day Care Centres operated, in this case, by a government-financed workplace, the Health Sciences Centre.

From my vantage point, there is clearly a sharp distinction and a sharp contradiction between what this government says and what it actually does. Bill 21, The Community Child Day Care Standards Act, is being introduced amidst proclamations of government support for the right of working people to Day Care and even quality Day Care and, ostensibly it is toward this aim that the government has introduced this Bill. But what the government is actually doing, with respect to the realities of providing Day Care, from my vantage point, is just the opposite and actually makes a mockery of any government Bill or policy claiming to support Day Care.

Let me provide some facts to back up this claim. Decent Day Care is unaffordable and unavailable for most working people today. The government policies for the past several years, and currently, have only worsened the situation. In 1975, the maintenance grant per child, per year to the Health Sciences Centre Day Care amounted to \$750.00. In 1982, today, the maintenance grant remains exactly at the same level. The Day Care fee, which was \$5 per child per day in 1975, has risen to a \$9.50 maximum, almost double. At the Health Sciences Centre we're paying \$10.50 per day because of a special arrangement to help subsidize some of the families there.

During this period of rising prices and falling incomes, falling real incomes, of working people, this shift of cost further onto the backs of parents using the Day Care, is even more unbearable. For one child, the cost is \$2,600 per year; for two children, it's \$5,200 per year; for three children, it's \$7,800 per year. This can equal up to one-half of a family's, after tax, spendable income which it must spend on Day Care in order for both parents or one parent in some cases, to work. In the spring of this year, the fee had just gone

up 10 percent over the previous level.

Now we are facing a threatened closure of the Day Care. Some space which we had in the hospital has to be relocated as of August 27 and we have recently been told that, unless more revenue is forthcoming, the entire Day Care at the Health Sciences Centre will be closed.

The government and the hospital have apparently refused to increase the funding. The government, while refusing to increase its funding, has allowed the hospital to raise the parents' fees in order to meet the cost of running the Day Care. According to calculations we've received, parents are likely facing an increase of \$4 per day per child, or \$1,000 more per year, per child. That will raise, for a family with three children, to an annual cost of \$10,800.00. This is a stab in the back to the Health Sciences Centre employees who need the Day Care and have counted on it in making arrangements for their jobs and their future, jobs which they could not do without Day Care for their children. Because of this action of the government and its hospital administrators, an even heavier cost burden and possible reduction in available service is being placed on the employees who are watching this so-called right to Day Care trampled underfoot. These actions, this situation is unacceptable.

The precedent that's being established, of raising fees as a way of maintaining Day Care services bodes ill for all working parents in the whole province who are even now stretched beyond their financial limits to achieve Day Care for their family. The overall cutback policy in government spending for Day Care makes a mockery of the government's stated aims to improve Day Care in Manitoba.

In conclusion, if the government is sincere about its obligation to work toward the provision of a universal and free Day Care, a goal which is a must for any decent and civilized society, then it must reverse this cutback policy; it must increase funding for Day Care to provide a decent standard of care; adequate pay for Day Care workers; and ensure adequate services to meet the need throughout the province. It must reduce the fees which are a heavy burden for working people and make universal accessibility impossible and, with regard to the Health Sciences Centre, it must ensure the secure existence and future of the Day Care there as a right for the Health Sciences Centre employees; and it must provide adequate funding to obviate the need for this intolerable fee increase which we have been recently faced with.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Kettner. Are there any questions for Dr. Kettner?

Ms Phillips.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, for clarification, did you say that the maintenance grant hasn't increased since 1975?

DR. J. KETTNER: For the Health Sciences Centre Day Care, it has not, according to my facts.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Well, our facts are a smidge different in that the Health Sciences Centre got rather preferential treatment in that the maintenance grant was

\$575 and is now \$800, but they got one-and-a-half times the maintenance grant that other centres got because of their special circumstances. So it has gone up \$50, but they were getting preferential treatment all along, so I don't want to leave on the record that you're implying that we haven't been doing the best we can for that particular operation.

DR. J. KETTNER: Well, if my facts are wrong and if I go by your facts, we're still faced with a situation where, even if the maintenance grant had increased by a 50 percent level in the last seven years, the fee has doubled and we're now faced with a situation where the proposed fee changes may actually triple the 1975 fee. I've given you the absolute figures that will amount to in order to keep the Day Care in existence, in the absence of further funding from the government, which we have been led to believe is not going to be forthcoming.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Yes, I also wanted to ask you a question. You started off with the assumption that we were bringing in this Bill but didn't have the moral fortitude, or whatever, to back it up with funding. That was your basic assumption at the beginning?

DR. J. KETTNER: This wasn't an assumption, this was an observation that, despite what the government has stated about its commitment to providing Day Care, to improving the standards and the availability, accessibility of Day Care, our experience is that the government is acting in such a way as to limit and reduce the available services and the quality of service to us in our setting.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Yes, on that, I'm wondering what you're basing that assumption on? You, I presume, are aware that we increased the Day Care budget by a third this year. To me, that's a fair commitment of where our priorities are and that, with this Act, that would be the direction this government is going. I wonder where you're getting that assumption?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Your fractions are going up all the time.

MS M. PHILLIPS: One-third. That's higher.

DR. J. KETTNER: I'm coming here as a user of the Health Sciences Centre Day Care and presenting the facts which are apparent to those of us who are using the Day Care. Our Day Care has been threatened with closure. I've outlined the maintenance grant development over the last seven years, as well as the increase in fees over the last seven years and we're now being presented with a very substantial increase in fees and a threat of closure of our Day Care, in the absence of any further funding from the government. On that basis, I've concluded my observation that the words of the government are not being translated into deeds in this situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm disappointed that the delegate chooses only to talk about a current

financial problem of one Day Care Centre in the province rather than addressing himself to the general principles of the bill and standards and so on, because he's talking about probably one of the richest financed Day Care Centres - the 'Cadillac' of the fleet - in the Province of Manitoba. You are talking about the most elaborate Day Care Centre we have in the province, and incidentally, the only Day Care Centre that has a significant deficit. There is no other Day Care Centre that has a significant deficit that's had to resort to looking to other means to help overcome its deficit. My question is this. You relate to having to pay additional fees, but is it not correct that those additional fees are based on an ability to pay?

DR. J. KETTNER: On the first point, I didn't limit my remarks to the situation at the Day Care which I use. I described, according to my facts, what has been the maintenance grant funding in comparison to the rising maximum fees for the entire province, as these figures, certainly the maximum fee change from \$5 to \$9.50, is a provincewide phenomenon. As far as the 'Cadillac' Day Care Centre which exists at the Health Sciences Centre, as far as I'm concerned, it's a very good Day Care. I wouldn't describe it in the terms that you have, simply on the basis that it reaches perhaps a minimum standard that a Day Care ought to provide in terms of training of staff and the staff-child ratios, but the fact is that there is nothing fancy about it and the income of the people who work there works out to some \$11,000 to \$12,000 per year, and 85 percent of the budget is towards the employees' salaries. If that's considered a Cadillac, and if the rest of the province is having Volkswagens, then the state of affairs is a lot worse than I had thought, on a provincewide basis.

HON. L. EVANS: Possibly it's a matter of perspective; it's a matter of judgment; it's a matter of what you expect and you could rightly say it's not a 'Cadillac.' It's what everyone else should try to achieve, at least, and maybe it would even be better . . .

DR. J. KETTNER: Excuse me for interrupting. I didn't answer your third question which was with regard to how this increased fee is going to be paid by the people who use the Day Care. To meet the cost of running the Day Care, there is an average increase of \$4 per child per year that will be necessary from the parents' fees. That's where I've addressed the figure of bringing this up to \$14.50 per child, per day. Whether some will pay more and others will pay less doesn't alter the mean average amount that is required, which represents a very significant increase.

Most of the people using the Day Care are ordinary employees, nurses, technicians, support staff of various types. There are some doctors, including myself. Most of us are residents on relatively low salary scales, still working in the hospital - and just to say that this increase is totally unaffordable by the vast majority of people who will be faced with having to consider other alternatives if this goes through as planned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? Mr. Evans.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, obviously we're in a bit of a quandary because this Day Care Centre has run substantial deficits in the past two years. When the previous government was in office, I believe it was over \$100,000 and, again, there's another huge deficit. There's a limit as to how much the taxpayers of Manitoba are supposed to pay to one particular Day Care Centre and to try to treat it on the same basis as all other Centres, so there's a dilemma there.

For some reason we have one large Centre running huge deficits, over \$100,000 in a year, and somehow or other we're supposed to pick up the tab and not be concerned about the fact that we're still not meeting the demand for two-thirds of the entire province. In other words, of the total demand for Day Care spaces, we're only meeting one-third. So my question is— and I think I asked it before but I don't think I got an answer—the fees that you talk about, increased fees, are they not on the basis of an ability to pay? In other words, the people who make additional funding, or above average, will pay more in the way of additional fees than those who make lower salaries and are you also . . . May I ask you this, because it's really out of order, are you aware that the Board of Directors of the hospital requested this?

DR. J. KETTNER: Can I respond to these questions? The first thing is, if the funding that the Health Sciences Centre Day Care receives from the government, through its maintenance grant and from the fees it collects from the parents, which are now at the top maximum provincial level, is not adequate to meet the cost of this Day Care which is, in the opinion of most, meeting the basic minimum requirements of a quality Day Care and does not have any padding or elaborate facilities or toys or whatever might be going through the imaginations of some people who think that all of this money is being spent on this one Day Care; if that funding isn't enough to provide basic quality Day Care, then the government ought to reconsider how much funding it's putting into Day Care and reconsider whether or not it can provide a quality Day Care service to the people of Manitoba. It's not my place to say where that money is going to come from. All that I'm saying is that if we're going to have an accessible and quality Day Care service in Manitoba, not just for where I work but throughout the province, then more funding is required. As far as how these fees are going to be distributed to the people where I'm working, it's not absolutely clear exactly how they will be distributed but even if they are distributed on some kind of income and ability-to-pay basis, the average increase is still going to be extremely large.

I forget what the third question was. As far as the hospital requesting this ability to raise the fees, from my vantage point, I consider that the hospital and the government, the hospital being the hospital administrator, is being charged with their duties by the government, I can't separate them. All I know is what comes down the bottom line which is the quality and availability of the service which exist at this workplace.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What is bothering me is that other Day Care Centres which are

not as well endowed as yours can operate without a deficit but yours is well endowed, according to the Minister, and yet it operates at a deficit. How do you explain that?

DR. J. KETTNER: I don't run this Day Care Centre but what I know about it is that, first of all, the wages paid to the people who work there are higher than the wages paid to workers in other Day Care Centres in Manitoba and that may be the main factor. They're not being paid high wages though. They're being paid wages in the area of \$1,100 per month which, I understand, compares with about \$900 per month being the average wage that other Day Care workers earn in the province. So that in itself may account for quite a big difference.

The child-to-teacher ratio is an improvement over the overall provincial average and it also runs a baby room with a number of children under the age of one, I think in the range of 20, which are more expensive because of requirements to run that facility. But this is a Day Care which should be seen as a standard that other Day Cares and the provincial goal, if it's sincere in raising the standards and making a minimum standard requirement, should see this as a standard to work toward, and could be improved also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Santos do you have a further question?

MR. C. SANTOS: Certainly sincerity is a different question from a question of money. You can be the most sincere person in the world, but if your pocket's empty it doesn't help. The same with government and you cannot say that it doesn't concern you where the money is coming from; it should concern you.

DR. J. KETTNER: I mean you have my money already. I'm here to urge you to do with it what can serve the aims of meeting Day Care standards in the province. I mean, if you want me to give views on where you can get more money. You can tax the profits of the drug companies; there's a suggestion if the government's looking for suggestions.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman, do you have a questions?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure that the presentation should focus entirely on one Day Care Centre as the Minister has suggested. It seems to be its preoccupation, but it's an interesting subject and I gather Dr. Kettner has made considerable reference to it and it goes right to the very issue that we're looking at here, standards and the costs of standards. You're saying, in effect, you can't do it at the Health Sciences Centre, where you've consistently run a deficit which I have experienced and the current Minister is experiencing; then how can the province implement any of these standards which have not yet been fully defined or delineated but at least are contemplated, because the experience of the Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery is that you can't do it without pouring millions of dollars more into the

program. I gather that's the point you're trying to make, Dr. Kettner.

DR. J. KETTNER: Well, those aren't exactly my words. The point I'm trying to make is that for a decent standard of Day Care and for a minimum standard the funding is not adequate to provide that.

I have also given the view that on a provincewide basis, the available maintenance grants and the rising cost of fees is such that for a large number of working parents Day Care is not available, and where it is available, that standard could use much improvement. If the fact is that this society can't provide a universally accessible Day Care with adequate standards then you should tell the people of Manitoba that it can't be done; but the fact is that working people have a right to adequate and decent Day Care for their children and it's a goal which any government in this society ought to work toward. From my vantage point the reverse direction is occurring; that the standard, the availability, is going down and the cost is going up.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, does not the debate then come down to what decent standards constitute? You're suggesting that the standards at the Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery are only minimal. Many others in this room and beyond it would agree with the Minister that in relative terms they are pretty impressive. Among other things you've referred to the higher staff-to-child ratio which exists there. There are enriched programs at the Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery which other Day Care Centres don't have.

If the government, in drafting its regulations, determined that it had to be pragmatic and realistic, which one assumes and hopes it will be, and that only a certain level of standards can be invoked or imposed at this point in time and those standards were lower than the standards currently existing at the Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery; and the government further said that for the time being, while we're phasing this program in, no one shall exceed those standards and levy surcharges in order that they be paid for, what would be the position of the Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery?

DR. J. KETTNER: Well, you're not asking me to speak on behalf of the Day Nursery, I don't think. You want to know what my position would be? I would object to any government decision which would mean standards for other Day Care is less than the standard which exists at the Health Sciences Centre today; and I would further object to a demand that the standard at the Health Sciences Centre itself be reduced. I would object to both of those. Both of those would indicate to me that the government is either unwilling or incapable of providing minimum standard Day Care on a broad basis in the province.

MR. L. SHERMAN: So, you're saying, Dr. Kettner, through you, Mr. Chairman, that the government regulations, when they're finally drafted and the Act is proclaimed, should be no less, in terms of the universal equitable accessible system we're seeking, than those that exist today at the Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery, is that correct?

DR. J. KETTNER: That's correct. If you're asking me, do I think there's padding in the Health Sciences Centre Day Care Nursery above and beyond a minimum standard, the answer is no.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further?
Mr. Kovnats.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I won't take too long and Dr. Kettner's not on trial here and I'm not going to put him on the spot, but when I hear that there's a deficit of \$100,000 or around that figure, it kind of scares me inasmuch as I've had some association with a Day Care Centre in my area. They have a deficit, I think, somewhere around \$3,000, \$4,000 or \$5,000 and they get the parents or the people that are involved, the parents of the children, involved in fund-raising enterprises, draws and fashion shows, draws on dinners. Has your group, at this point, done anything to have draws with not expensive prizes, use bedpans or something like that, but something where they could raise money to supplement the deficit?

MR. CHAIRMAN: May be you can suggest a free operation.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That was the next thing I was going to give, but under Medicare I think that would be a wasted prize. You know fund raising things to help the operation of the Day Care Centres is really what I'm trying to get across.

DR. J. KETTNER: Well, fund raising to my way of thinking is either unofficial taxation, when you ask other people who have nothing to do with the use of the Day Care to fund it, or it's just increased fees in the form of direct contribution from the pockets of those who are using it, and it doesn't deal in anyway with the overall issue of providing adequate funding through government for what is considered a right to working parents.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That certainly answers my question. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions for Dr. Kettner? Thank you very much, Dr. Kettner, for coming and expressing your views.

DR. J. KETTNER: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next is Donna McKay. We're getting there. I think we'll stay till we finish if it's okay with the other members of the Committee. We've only got three presentations left.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, if you require a motion, by leave, I move that we stay until we're finished by 6 o'clock or whatever comes first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think we require a motion. Fine, thank you.

MRS. D. MCKAY: Mr. Chairman, Honourable

Friday, 25 June, 1982

Members, Ladies and Gentlemen. I shall be very brief. I'm a provincial employee, who in the capacity of my job has observed a problem related to Day Care which brought me here today to this hearing.

There are people in our society who are faced with emergencies which we commonly call family crises. Some of these people become battered wives and they, with their children, are obliged to leave their homes and seek refuge. Many of these people seek refuge in publicly-supported shelters such as Osborne House. They stay there with their children and, in fact, Osborne House has had many thousands of children go through its doors.

It's my concern that this bill does not adequately define emergency services for Day Care. It is my contention that these children do not need to be taken into child welfare care. What the mother needs is some supportive, 24-hour availability of Day Care to assist her through a difficult period and it's highly desirable under these circumstances that the standards developed by Day Care can be applied for highly specialized, temporary Day Care for this group of people.

I really believe that although standards and special programs for different ages of children is very important, that there is a case for setting up specialized Day Care which will allow family groups to stay together because of the nature of the crisis they have been subjected to; that is, family groups of children where there could be a variety of programming in one location. Hopefully, these locations would be located close to shelters like Osborne House or alternate shelters which are being considered now in places like Dauphin and Portage la Prairie and by citizens in our province.

I think that we make a mistake if we only limit our Day Care to daytime care. I am not one that supports a great extension and I do not believe that the state has the responsibility to be the parent 24 hours a day. We have heard a lot of representations today for the government providing 24-hour Child Care. My contention here is that, we try to provide this care for our special groups that need this, but that otherwise we attempt to support parenting by parents, rather than by the government. I suggest that we have some responsibility to treat parenting as employment, to encourage it by consideration of pensions and work-related rewards.

It seems to me that the government here is trying to meet too many people's needs. I don't think the government is a parent. I think it's undesirable for the government to take over a lot of parent responsibilities, but I think the government could encourage parenting to be considered employment and to be taken more seriously, rather than just a feminist complaint.

When we see people coming here and making all kinds of representation for the government to take over parenting functions, I think it's time for us to begin to look at supporting parents in our society.

In this case, I feel that as a government worker, I think it's important that we provide emergency service for abused parents and for children of those parents.

I will restrict my request that the emergency and 24-hour Day Care be provided for in this bill. However, I do not greatly support the government taking over 24-hour Day Care on a general basis. I don't think our

economy could always provide for it and I would much rather see, in general, that we support parenting by parents.

Thank you very much.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you very much. There's no question that there is a need here as you describe to look after emergency situations.

I'm wondering whether the need that you describe should or could be properly addressed and met by a Child Day Care thrust. Perhaps I don't understand your definition of emergency service, but it seems to me it involves 24-hour periods and maybe longer. I was just wondering, wouldn't that be better looked after in our child and family service thrust, for instance, through the Children's Aid Societies, we have children placed in foster homes on temporary basis and so on. Is that really not in that category, rather than under the Day Care Program?

MRS. D. MCKAY: Well, I think there is some overlap, but that's not exactly what I meant. I'm referring to people who generally are in what could be called a temporary crisis lasting seven to ten days, which is the maximum time a person can stay in Osborne House.

I really feel that it's a temporary need and it seems that many times women flee from their homes due to abuse which generally occurs at night or on weekends. It occurred to me that the standard Day Care probably is not open sufficient hours to accommodate some of the evening care and/or weekend care that could come up - not so much night care - but certainly extended hours. I think most of the could be met by this, rather than the more expensive alternative of actually taking children from their parent on a full-time basis, as occurs with child welfare even if it's temporary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms Phillips.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. Mrs. McKay, have you had any experience with Day Care Programs and what kind of programs they offer?

MRS. D. MCKAY: Yes.

MS M. PHILLIPS: The kind of proposal that you're making - say, for instance, a Day Care Centre stayed open till midnight in case some children dropped in or dropped in in the day time in an emergency situation, would you not find that would be disrupting for a ongoing Day Care Program.

MRS. D. MCKAY: I'm suggesting that some specialized Day Care could be set up in conjunction with shelter programs. I'm not suggesting it's a standard Day Care.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Are you suggesting, say, that Osborne House be for the women who are beaten and their children are in another Centre?

MRS. D. MCKAY: No, I'm suggesting it be adjacent. There are existing day Centres in most communities that could be close to refuges. I think these refuges are developing and I'm not suggesting that the refuges

themselves have to operate Day Care, but I'm suggesting it be run in some co-operative planning, in order to provide for these children.

I think these children do have some special needs for a calm environment where they maintain some of their family group. I don't consider it a standard Day Care request, no.

I'm concerned, because the Day Care bill may not be flexible enough to allow some of these specialized Day Cares to develop as temporary supports for families in crisis.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, through you to Mrs. McKay, are you aware that Osborne House takes in the children and the mothers?

MRS. D. MCKAY: Oh yes, but what I'm saying is that in a house like that, where there are a number of distraught women and children, I think it would be more constructive for those children to be in some kind of organized Day program rather than to be in that environment for 10 days without an alternative, really.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, following on that, it seems to be the common philosophy that when there is a trauma in the family the best thing to do, and you were speaking very supportively of the family, that it's very important to keep the family together; and to separate the mother from the children at a traumatic time like that when, in a place like Osborne House, the whole program is set up, not just to deal with the mothers but also the children who might have been beaten or watched their mother being beaten, and dealing with those things.

MRS. D. MCKAY: I'm sorry but I would like to clarify that a little. I do not really believe there is that much standard development in that program for Day Care for children. Now these are all fairly new programs, these refuges, and they're really designed primarily for shelter and counselling to help the mother. During this period the mother is usually very distraught, often injured, often under medical care and I really feel it would be an advantage to provide some specialized Day Care programming to assist her and to give the children some specialized Day Care Program.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, you said, through this bill, we were taking over the responsibility of parents, rather than supporting parents.

MRS. D. MCKAY: No, not through the bill. Through some of the representations that have been made today it had that sound.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Would you not consider it to be an emergency say, for instance, if a mother had a babysitter at home and was a single parent and the babysitter quit on Friday night and the only alternative would be Group Day Care? Do you not think it's a responsibility to support the family, be it because of economic reasons both parents have to work or because there's only one parent?

MRS. D. MCKAY: Oh yes, I'm not objecting to supporting the family as much, I'm talking specifically

about a group of women and children who have been forced out of their homes because of circumstances.

MS M. PHILLIPS: I wanted to clarify whether it was just an additional specialized service that you were requesting or whether, with your comments about government intrusion into Day Care, or not supporting families the right way by having a Day Care Program.

MRS. D. MCKAY: No, I am asking for extension of the Day Care services for rather specialized group need and I'm also stating that I think the government could do more to support family life, in general, which is two different things.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Yes, it is two different things and I'm wondering if you feel offering government subsidized Day Care or our whole Day Care budget, our Day Care legislation is not a commitment to supporting families to become self-sufficient, either in emergency situations or the alternative of having them on Social Assistance.

MRS. D. MCKAY: Well I support the Day Care Bill and I consider it very progressive and very helpful but I do think that our government could do more to support parenting and recognize it as employment. You know, people here talked about wanting employment and I think if some of that parenting work was considered employment and assisted and treated like employment, perhaps more people would look after their children.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Are you also suggesting then, that not only do we offer a quality Day Care Program like we're proposing under the Act, but also emergency services like we've just discussed.

MRS. D. MCKAY: Yes, specific emergency services.

MS M. PHILLIPS: But you're also suggesting that we find money for wages for housework as well.

MRS. D. MCKAY: No, not necessarily, but you know the government is considering pensions, for example, for housewives and so on and I think more could be done because that is hard work. I'm just saying that there are other ways to approach the problem of employment, in addition to Day Care.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? Thank you very much, Mrs. McKay.

MRS. D. MCKAY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dorothy Kotler, please.

MS D. KOTLER: I represent Children's House. Children's House is a nursery school in the centre of Winnipeg. For 15 years we've been offering a part-time learning environment to children from all over the city. We have approximately 90 children in the school every year. They are between the ages of two-and-a-half and six and many of these children stay with us for three years.

During our 15 years of operation we've been in contact with many people who have a great concern for the first years of a child's life outside the home. It's during these early years, when children's sensitivities are at their height, that the major part of their personalities, their intelligence and their attitudes are formed. At this age they are literally absorbing their environments and this is the time when the most learning takes place. That's why it's imperative for children at this age to have the best possible conditions and the best possible environment.

Children's House, since we are not a Day Care Centre and since we have the luxury of being in the school when the children are not there, we've been able to concentrate on providing that environment, an optimum environment for little children. Our program has become widely recognized and is often used as a resource to Day Care workers, to the Red River Community College Child Care Course and to many other people in the field of early childhood.

An extremely important aspect of our program, and of our environment, is that it includes children who are from various backgrounds, various situations and who have different needs, because it doesn't matter to a little child at that age what colour, size or shape the person beside him has. The child reaches out to everything in the environment with an uninhibited eagerness and love and openness that is not usually equalled at any other time in his or her life. So if we want our children to learn tolerance and acceptance for all people in the community they must be with all kinds of people in the community at this early age. For that reason, it's always been important to us that our program is open and accessible to all parents who want it for their children, regardless of their ability-to-pay.

For working parents, to send a child to nursery school, involves some transportation problems at midday, and the school has taken a lot of responsibility in helping working parents to make it possible for their children to attend. We have extended our hours and we've provided lunch facilities and our staff and parents regularly drive those children whose parents can't drive them themselves. In addition to that, we have also tried to maintain a very low tuition so that we can admit as wide as possible a range of families.

In 1974 we joined the Provincial Day Care Program hoping to widen our access to working parents and low income families, but we found that there are several catches in the regulations that have been working against our goals. The first one is the purely financial consideration and it comes up in the area of the regulations that classify a Centre to determine its eligibility for the maintenance grant. We are classified as a part-time Centre, operating between six and 10 half days a week, so we are eligible for only half the maximum maintenance grant and then this figure is multiplied by half the number of children who attend the school, that is the number of licensed spaces that we have.

The past regulations provided for only one other higher category, that of a full day Centre - which we are not. So, we've been placed in the same category as the three day a week Nursery Centre, Nursery School, but the nature of our program and of our expenses greatly increases our financial needs beyond those of the three day a week Nursery School. We operate five

full days a week; we employ five full-time trained staff members and we serve the needs of about 90 children every day. Our expenses, in fact, are very similar to those of a full-time Day Care Centre with 45 children. As I said, we're currently paid half the maintenance grant for half the number of children who attend, and that's not enough for us. We're currently in quite a desperate financial situation. Our budget operates on a break-even basis when we're lucky and, at the moment, we're trying to operate on a deficit budget and that is with a tremendous effort on the part of parents to raise money. Our parents raise a minimum of \$10,000 a year, sometimes \$15,000 a year. We have quite low salaries and we do a lot of penny-pinching.

We ask, therefore, that you introduce some flexibility into these categories of the regulations so that a higher rate of payment can be made to those schools that are open for five full days a week over and above the ones that are open for three days or four days a week.

The other area of difficulty that we have is that we've been struggling to accommodate children of working parents and single parents and low-income families who need full Day Care because we find there are many benefits both to our program and to the Day Care Centre and also to the children by trying to accommodate them. They have to spend the other part of the day in a Day Care Centre and we've been hampered by the rigidity of the plus and minus four hours' regulation. So, we ask that some flexibility also be included in that area.

What we would like to see is a situation where Nursery Schools since, by the ages of the children that we serve, are being funded under The Day Care Act, can be used as a supplement to Day Care Centres and also as a resource to Day Care workers and to parents and to other educators in early childhood. Unfortunately, the first step towards such a situation would be to make it possible for Nursery schools to survive, so we have to ask for more money.

I'd also like to add Children's House voice in support of the others who have already come before you seeking better conditions for young children. What has impressed me, always, about Day Care workers and people in the field of Day Care is that, for so many years, under such difficult working conditions and despite such poor financial remuneration for their work, they have carried on. It is a fact. These people are not after big salaries; they're not looking for power; they simply see the importance of these early years in a child's life. They're asking for better conditions because they know that this is the most important time in a child's life for their environment to be the best. It's when environment has its greatest impact and it's the only time when environment can mold and develop a child's life. Of course, we all want environments that are conducive to healthy growth and development all through our lives, but these people working with very little children realize that by the time a child enters grade school, the patterns for life are already set. In that sense, it really is a responsibility of the entire community to see that young children have the best conditions.

Whether we have a young child or not, these little people are going to be running our country when we are going to be wanting to settle into peaceful retire-

ment, so it's in all our better interests to ensure their healthy upbringing and the job starts here with the very young. By the time a child is in a correctional institute, it's too late. So we applaud and we stand behind the Day Care community.

We also recognize and greatly appreciate this government's stand in undertaking the responsibility of making this a community issue and also in trying, in these very difficult financial times, to meet the needs of working parents and of single parents and, of course, all the time having to keep in mind the needs and the rights of the children themselves. It's a mighty undertaking and all of us who work with little children and who have children of our own and who care about the developmental needs of children and about the future greatly appreciate what you're trying to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, very much, Ms Kotler. Are there any questions for Ms Kotler? Thank you, very kindly.

Next could I have Mr. Brian Proctor, please. Brian Proctor?

MR. B. PROCTOR: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're welcome. Go ahead, Sir.

MR. B. PROCTOR: I'd like to address a general issue. The first point concerned was a specific one regarding regulations which I understand can be foregone 'till a later date when . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. B. PROCTOR: I'll forego that and go on to the second point. I've heard it raised again and again while listening to other presentations, especially by Mr. Evans of the sort of two-fold necessity of expanding spaces and also expanding quality and that money is the big problem at the back and I know it's at the back of all your minds. There's only so much and it isn't enough. We all know that so let's not pretend about it being enough any more. Okay?

But one thing we could do in order that in the future there will be enough money is to expand advocacy in the Day Care field and to build advocacy in the Day Care field right into the Act itself by providing for some sort of independent advocacy position, like a child advocate, funded by the government, independent of the political parties and independent of the Day Care Office itself, so that person can help in the general education of the public which is really the basic problem. Our society just does not provide enough money for adequate Day Care. We seem to want F-18 fighter planes which cost more than the entire Day Care budget of Manitoba, each. That has to stop. We have to educate the public to do that.

Up to now, there has been a terrible burden placed upon citizens' groups and upon Child Care workers to provide for this advocacy. We can't expect the civil servants to do so because their nature as civil servants is that they have to, in a sense, represent the status quo and argue for its quality. I've heard that again and again, both from the politicians and I've also heard it from the Day Care Office itself. They have to represent the way it is and argue that it is adequate to some

extent. They can't go out and be public advocates. Okay? But, what they could do is, if it was built into the Act itself, an advocacy position was built into the Act, and funded through the Act independently, that person could go out to the public, could hold press conferences, could make press releases, could generally educate the public as to the reality of the Day Care situation, which is pretty terrible. It seems to me that now's the time to do that right when the Act is fresh and put it right in there. I've looked all through Bill 21 and there was nothing there to suggest that there was any recognition even that this was necessary. We have to get to the public and we have to increase awareness and a child advocate would do so.

Listening to the Federation of Labour's three-pronged thing with the parents, the workplace and I forget the other one. There wasn't one for the child. The child needs to be advocated for and the developmental needs of the child have to be brought to the public's attention so that we can have more money for Mr. Evans to give out to Day Care Centres the next time we have public hearings like this.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay are there any questions for Mr. Proctor? Ms Phillips.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Yes thank you very much, Brian. That's a very interesting idea. I wish that you'd called me a couple of months ago before it went to the printers. That is a very interesting concept. Mind you, it doesn't have to be outside. For instance, my experience at the Women's Bureau, when that was set up by Order-in-Council, the mandate was to go out and be an advocate, an education force, in the province about the needs for women in the work force.

MR. B. PROCTOR: Well the women's groups have been eloquent, as has the Coalition, has the Federation of Labour, as has various groups that we've heard coming through here. The point is, you don't have enough money in your budget to meet all our needs; that's the point that I'm getting at, is you've got to build more advocacy in there to educate the public and the politicians and your Highways Minister, and send Mr. Pawley off to Trudeau to say, we don't need that extra F-18 fighter plane, it'll probably crash anyway, but we do need another generation of properly cared for children.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, what I'm suggesting, you said that would have to be someone especially in the Act outside a hired civil servant.

MR. B. PROCTOR: Yes. What I was getting at there was that they would have the independence in their funding to be able to say what is really going on and not necessarily what we would like to think was going on; and not be fired by somebody for saying so; and not have to run that risk of jeopardizing their career for saying so, which is a terrible situation to be putting people who care about children in.

MS M. PHILLIPS: I appreciate your point and it's certainly something to be considered. Whether we get it in this time, that's something to certainly be consi-

Friday, 25 June, 1982

dered and, of course, Acts can be amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for Mr. Proctor?

Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: How does public education, through your advocacy idea, how will that increase the money for Day Care without prejudicing the other types of public programs?

MR. B. PROCTOR: If the public program, its prejudicing is, for example, the example I gave of the F-18 fighter plane, I think would be very laudible prejudice, in answer to your question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? That finishes the public presentations.

Thank you very much, Mr. Proctor.

We could go on now, I suppose, but I think the general feeling of the members is the Committee rise and that we return tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. and hopefully we can get through clause-by-clause tomorrow morning. Is there general agreement? (Agreed)

Committee rise.